

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_150037

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

**UNDERSTANDING YOURSELF
AND YOUR SOCIETY**

UNDERSTANDING YOURSELF AND YOUR SOCIETY

by

JOHN M. EWING, B.A. (Queens), D.PAED. (Toronto)

*Principal, and Professor of Philosophy and Psychology,
Victoria College, Victoria, B. C.*

*Formerly Instructor in Educational Psychology,
Provincial Normal School, Vancouver, B. C.*

Illustrations by Frances Neil



Authorized in the Province of Saskatchewan

TORONTO
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA LIMITED

COPYRIGHT, CANADA, 1946

by

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA LIMITED

All rights reserved—no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in a magazine or newspaper.

PRINTED IN CANADA

WRIGLEY PRINTING COMPANY LIMITED, 1112 SEYMOUR STREET, VANCOUVER, B. C

PREFACE

THE PURPOSE OF THIS BOOK


While this book is intended to be of use to the general reader who wishes to familiarize himself with the principles of human nature and society, it has primarily been written for students in the senior year of high school. Much of the illustration has been selected with this primary purpose in mind.

This book is emphatically not an introduction to formal psychology and sociology—it does not pretend to present a full and systematic treatment of these subjects. Yet many of the main ideas in psychology and sociology have their place within its pages, and the reader will find much enlightenment in the practical business of living. It has been written in the belief that the understanding of people and their society is of immense value to everyone, every day, and in every situation.

Take, by way of illustration, the case of John Gillespie. We have all met someone who resembles John. He is a big fellow, seventeen years old, still pretty ramshackle in build, and painfully awkward in a social group. What is the matter with him? He would certainly like to know. Why is he so diffident and lacking in ease — especially in mixed company? A little



insight into his own personality and into social relationships is exactly what he needs.



Then take the case of Mary Williams, a very nice, intelligent girl, who spoils the whole effect by breaking into a silly giggle at all the wrong times. She would give anything to stop it but it breaks out in spite of her. What can be done for Mary? A great deal. The thing she chiefly lacks is the confidence a little knowledge of human nature would bring her. Mary and John, together with many other

people, suffer endless embarrassment simply because they are victims of ignorance.

Social science, in the broad sense, has to do with the understanding of human nature as it works out in the ordinary affairs of life. Human beings do not act at random, their actions are the outcome of definite motives, and are in accordance with definite principles. This being so, it is quite possible—though often difficult—to predict what a given person or group of persons will do in a given situation. The ability to make such a prediction is highly important, because the person who has no idea how another will act in a certain set of circumstances is at a grave loss in dealing with him. Most of our troubles grow out of the fact that we are ignorant not only of human nature in general, but of our own natures in particular.

Here is a case in point. Bill Jones, who is a first-class athlete but no speaker, has been asked by a group of his

friends to run for the presidency of the students' council. What should he do? He would like to hold the position, but he shrinks from appearing on the platform in the role of candidate. Moreover, he feels that defeat would be hard to bear. Is he capable of sizing up the importance of athletics in the mind of the average student? Can he foretell the attitude of the staff? Does he know how much influence his friends have? Can he learn to handle himself before an audience? It is surely obvious that before Bill Jones can reach a sensible decision, he must see pretty clearly both into himself and into his fellow-students.

There is no need these days to put forward a plea for scientific education, since everyone admits its importance. For a great many years, physics, chemistry and biology have been taught in the schools, and we believe a knowledge of these subjects to be a necessary part of the equipment of every educated person. In fact, we place a tremendous emphasis on scientific education today. We speak of our own time as the Scientific Age; we know full well that our spectacular control of natural forces is due to our insight into the scientific laws that govern them; we are thoroughly aware that we depend on technology for most of the goods and comforts of civilized life. It is no more than plain common sense that we should study those sciences on which our physical well-being is based.

But we have not by any means gone all the way. In spite of the emphasis we have placed on physical science, we have hitherto most woefully neglected social science. We have taken great pains to understand the world about us, but very little pains to understand the people who inhabit that world. As a result, our material development is far ahead of our social insight: our understanding of machines and industrial processes is far greater than our understanding of man and the means to his happiness.

For every hundred people who are well able to deal with a sparking electrical device or a baulky engine, scarcely one or two know anything worth while about such problems as good sportsmanship and race prejudice and propaganda. The troubles that afflict us in this day and age are not due to our lack of ability to control physical things, but to our ignorance of human beings and the principles that govern their social behaviour.

There are two chief reasons for this unfortunate state of affairs. First, social science is comparatively new: it has grown up only within the last fifty years. As a result, it is not yet generally understood and applied. Owing to its newness as compared with physical science, it has not yet become part of the working knowledge of the average man.

Second, the subject-matter of social science is highly complex, and does not lend itself to simple analysis. Man is much harder to understand than the machines he has created, much harder to explain than heat or light or chemical action. He is a creature of so many motives, his behaviour springs from so many sources and is subject to so many influences, that he cannot be accounted for in a few neat and accurate phrases.

This is not to say, mark you, that human actions cannot be traced to their causes in the same way that events are traced to their causes in physics or chemistry. No human behaviour—not even the strangest—ever happens by chance. Causes always exist. The point is that these causes are much more difficult to trace in human behaviour than in the field of physical science. There is no principle in psychology, for example, that compares in simplicity, accuracy or reliability with Boyle's Law. The principles of social science do not enable us to say how a human being is certain to act in a given situation, but only how he is

most likely to act. It is always a question of probabilities. The great value of social science is that it shows us what the probabilities are.

To illustrate, consider the case of a boy who is struck in the face by one of his fellows. How will he behave? The general answer, applying to boys as a group, is that he will strike back. But this is a particular case, and particular circumstances must be taken into consideration. Perhaps he has been so trained that he cannot bring himself to return a blow. Perhaps the striker is a boy for whom he has a strong affection, or a boy he has good reason to fear. Perhaps he feels that the blow was deserved. Perhaps he sees the principal looking out of his office window. Perhaps many things. You must see that in order to predict this boy's behaviour with accuracy, it is necessary to know *all* the facts. In ordinary life we rarely know all the facts about any individual or about any situation. But there is this to be added: the more we know about the individual and the situation he faces, and the more we know about the principles that underlie human behaviour, the more accurately we will be able to foretell what he will do.


What then is to be got from the study of social science? These four things at least: a shrewd insight into human motives; a knowledge of human development, both physical and mental; an understanding of social relationships; and an ability to predict the probable behaviour of individuals or of groups in various circumstances.

Now these four are just the things most needed in the world today. The great majority of people live their whole lives through without clearly grasping any one of them—with disastrous results not only to their own social lives but also to the social lives of all with whom they live. A few people learn these things only through harsh experience and after many blunders, trusting to an expensive trial-

and-error process and gaining insight only when they are old. Yet to lack these things is to be little better than a social misfit and a simpleton, and to have learned them is to be socially capable and wise.

Look for a moment at the word 'wisdom', and the matter will become clear. Wisdom is something all of us hold in high esteem and wish sincerely to acquire. What sort of person then, do we regard as wise?

Here is a learned man—a man, shall we say, who reads five languages and who writes important books on the ancient Roman and Greek literature. He is what may be called a profoundly scholarly man, and we respect him accordingly. But his scholarship, alas, is no guarantee of his social capacity. He may be so aloof from social life, so inexperienced in ordinary, every-day relationships with people, that he cannot take his place in a group with ease and confidence. He may even be a hopeless failure in looking after his own financial affairs. To be learned is one thing; to be wise is another.



Here, on the other hand, is a skilled man—a clever mechanic, radio engineer or contractor. We are full of admiration for the efficient way in which he solves his practical problems and does his work. But skill also is no guarantee of wisdom. He may have few reliable ideas beyond the field of his special training; he may know little or nothing about raising his children or dealing with his boss; he may be at the mercy of every plausible speaker he hears or of every magazine article he reads. He may, in fact, be anything but wise.

What then do we mean by wisdom? Apparently, neither learning nor skill, but something more. The wise man is he who has been a close observer of people, whose keen interest in them has led him to study their make-up and the ways in which they behave. He has acquired the ability, by this observation and study, to perceive motives and predict probable reactions. Moreover, his insight into human nature has made him tolerant and sympathetic: he has a kindly eye for human weaknesses, and never expects more than people can perform. Yet withal, he knows the splendid possibilities of his fellow-men, and encourages them to put forth their greatest and most worthy effort.

There is, of course, no easy road to wisdom. But some roads are much shorter and more certain than others. It is possible to arrive at wisdom the hard way—by bitter experience and many failures. Such has been the way in the past. Today, however, it is a poor road to take. Social science, thoughtfully studied and bravely applied, takes a great deal of trial and error out of human relationships. It throws light on all aspects of human life, and enables the student to meet his social world with understanding, confidence and ease.

The purpose of this book is to make such an outcome possible, to provide a relatively short and certain road to

wisdom. It must not be read purely as a task, however. If it is to be of practical value, its reading must be accompanied by *thought, observation* and *discussion*. To memorize its contents for examination purposes would be to take away most of its value, and would defeat the whole intention with which it has been written.

CONTENTS

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
PREFACE: The Purpose of This Book	v
PART I. PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT	
1. Psychology and Its Methods	1
2. Human Needs and Human Adjustment	7
3. The Physical Means of Adjustment	16
4. Reflexes and Emotions	24
5. Intelligence	33
6. Habit	38
7. Conditioning	46
8. How Meaning Arises	57
9. Heredity	64
10. Physical Development	75
11. Mental Development	82
12. The Period of Adolescence	101
• 13. Learning	111
14. How To Study	128
15. Personality	132
16. Enhancing the Ego	143
17. Motive and Frustration	155
• 18. The Art of Speech	167

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
19. Humour	179
20. Personal Culture	186
21. • Family Living	192
22. * How To Get Along with Other People	204

PART II. SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

23. Society	219
24. Forms of Society	238
25. Institutions	256
26. Work	275
27. Manners, Morals, and Laws	294
28. Social Conditioning	311
29. Influencing Public Opinion	326
30. Operating a Democracy	343
31. Understanding Other Peoples	358
32. The Good Life	370
Index	381

PART I


PERSONAL
DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER I

PSYCHOLOGY AND ITS METHODS

THE study of human nature is a part of the science of psychology, so it seems reasonable to start off with a clear idea of what psychology is. The word psychology is nowadays on everyone's lips, and as a result it is often used very loosely indeed. Novelists apply it freely; business men are never done talking about it; all manner of speeches are devoted to its discussion. The writer has even listened to a group of apparently sane people threshing out the psychology of the conjunctive pronoun—whatever that may be. Psychology is in some danger of becoming a fog-word—a word so vague and impressive as to have no genuine meaning at all.

What then is psychology? In simple terms, it is the scientific study of behaviour. It studies behaviour because



that is the only reliable way of studying the mind. The chief interest of psychology is not in behaviour itself, but in the mental pattern behaviour reveals. Psychology therefore is limited to creatures that can be said to possess minds, and does not include the vegetable kingdom or inanimate nature. It is proper to discuss the psychology of a man, or a dog, or even a worm; but it is wholly improper to discuss the psychology of a tulip or a tornado.

Every subject of psychological study then, must have a mind—and whatever argument there may be regarding the mind of a dog or of a worm, there is no doubt that man possesses the article in question. Even the lowliest form of human mentality, the idiot, has a mind.

A definition more suitable to our present purpose is now in order: Human psychology is the scientific study of human behaviour, with a view to exploring and understanding the human mind.

It may be objected here that this is a very roundabout way of proceeding, that all we have to do is look into our minds for the necessary information. Why go to all the trouble of studying behaviour to find out about the mind, when the mind itself can be directly explored? Surely we can understand other people's motives by analysing our own, and predict other people's actions by asking ourselves what we would do in similar situations.

The direct method is used, of course, and is called introspection. We can look within and learn a great deal. Undoubtedly. But there are distinct limits to the procedure, as you will quickly see. Introspection is unreliable in several obvious ways.

Consider old Mr. Dryasdust, for example. He is a venerable man verging on eighty, whose opinions and tastes have not changed one iota in the past thirty years. He has a contempt for modern music, art, poetry, manners and morals.

Do you think his introspections would throw any useful light on the motives and conduct of his grandson? Or, to turn matters round, do you think his grandson's introspections would have any value in explaining the mind of Mr. Dryasdust?

Again, how should we hope by introspection to understand the mental workings of an idiot? We, fortunately enough, are not idiots. Our minds differ from that of the idiot in a thousand respects. If we depended on introspection, there could be no genuine psychology of feeble-minded people. The same argument applies in the cases of the very young, the very old, and the mentally diseased. It applies also to every creature below the human level. Wherever there is a wide difference between two minds, the examination of one is of small service in understanding the other.

As a third point, have you ever introspected one of your own emotions? Recall the last time you were thoroughly angry. What if you had said to yourself, "Ah! What a glorious opportunity for introspection!" and had seized hold of paper and pencil? Can you imagine yourself taking careful stock of your thoughts, your heart-beat, your changes of colour, your temperature—and remaining angry? The plain truth is that when you set about analysing a mental state, you invariably change it. Your introspections are never accurate.

In the last place, we are dreadfully prejudiced where our own motives are concerned; we see ourselves ninety-nine per cent of the time through rose-coloured glasses. Here, for instance, is Harry Robinson who has ignored his father's request to cut the grass. What reasons does he give himself for this neglect of duty? Laziness? No, no. Unco-operativeness? Why, certainly not. He has far better and more unselfish reasons than these. There was an important football practice and he owed it to the fellows to be there. Then

when he got home, his sister was doing her hour at the piano, and the noise of the lawnmower would have disturbed her. After that it was suppertime, of course, and with the best intentions in the world he was thwarted. So Harry can look back on the events of the afternoon with perfect satisfaction, and find nothing in his mind but excellent motives.

Is this true to life? Do you think the picture is badly overdrawn, or can you match Harry's introspections with some recent ones of your own? The matter can be left to your private conscience. It is rather well established, however, that few people can be trusted to be scrupulously fair where their self-respect or interest is concerned.

Having examined some of the reasons why introspection is not a very scientific method to use in psychology, we may now turn to two methods that are infinitely more reliable, namely: experiment and observation. These two—and especially experiment—have been responsible for most of the progress made in the science.

There is no need to talk here about the value of experimental method; anyone who has studied physical science admits it without argument. A great deal of laboratory and research work has been done in psychology, and has enormously increased our accurate knowledge of human nature. The sensitiveness of our sense organs has been investigated, the strength of our various motives has been studied, our intelligence has been measured, and the process of our development has been analysed and controlled. All this and much more.

But you will readily see the experimental method is unsuitable for use in the ordinary give and take of life. You cannot, for example, give your friend an intelligence test to make sure he is up to a satisfactory mental standard, or estimate your father's self-control by subjecting him to a graduated series of annoyances. Even the best friend might

be just a little put out. As to your father—long-suffering man though he doubtless is—there is a strong likelihood his good nature would buckle under the strain.

Clearly, you cannot do much experimenting of your own, but you can make good use of the experimental findings of others. Many such findings appear throughout this book. Later on, you may take formal courses in psychology and sociology and become acquainted with a great many more. Remember always that our most exact knowledge in the field of human nature has come from painstaking laboratory investigation and research. Almost all the reliable principles we know have been discovered by experiment.

One thoroughly sound and practical method remains for your use, namely, observation. You can study behaviour everywhere about you, you can study it through keen, unprejudiced eyes, and gain valuable insight into the motives that lie behind it. But this, as you need scarcely be told, is not the easiest thing in the world to do. It calls for close attention, complete honesty, and shrewd judgment. You must be vitally interested in people; you must learn to look at their behaviour without personal bias; and you must reach conclusions about them only after long and careful study. If you do these things, you will one day become an excellent judge of human nature.

It would be folly, however, to suppose that the method of observation will produce quick results. From the very beginning there will, of course, be an improvement in your ability to size up both your fellows and yourself, but many years will pass before you become expert. Expertness comes only after a great deal of experience. You will need to have much observation and thought behind you, before you are able to perceive motives and indicate probable behaviour—including your own. Even if you begin now to observe as faithfully and thoughtfully as you can, the likelihood is

you will have reached middle age by the time you can truthfully be spoken of as wise.

Now, in summary, three methods are used in the study of human nature: introspection, experiment and observation. The first, introspection (or looking into your own mind), is one that must be applied with great discretion. It is reliable only under these conditions: the introspector must be absolutely honest with himself, seeing his own motives exactly as they are; and his mind must be of a similar kind to those of such other individuals as he is seeking to understand. Where these conditions are fulfilled, however, introspection is of undoubted value.

The second, experiment, is the source of our most trustworthy knowledge. We must be willing to study its findings and acquaint ourselves with the principles it has patiently uncovered. But we can scarcely employ it in private life. If we try to do so, we find human beings are very different from guinea-pigs—they do not lend themselves with the slightest good will to our manipulations.

The third, observation, is by far the most practical method we have at our disposal. Here is something every sensible person can learn to do. Around us everywhere—at home, in school, on the playground, down town—people and groups of people are behaving in accordance with the principles of human nature. All we have to do is observe them with accuracy through unprejudiced eyes. Then, as time goes on—especially if we also do some honest introspecting and a little scientific reading—we shall come to have a sound working knowledge of the human subject. And that is as much as most of us need.

CHAPTER 2

HUMAN NEEDS AND HUMAN ADJUSTMENT

THE first thing we discover about human behaviour is that it is invariably an effort to adjust the individual a little better to his physical and social environment. The key word in psychology is adjustment. Such being so, we must endeavour to know exactly what adjustment is.

Before going into this, however, it is necessary for us to have a clear understanding of human needs, because it is to satisfy these that we become adjustively active. If we had no unsatisfied needs, we should be quite uninterested and inert. But there is no danger of such an event! No human being on earth, be he never so healthy, wealthy and wise, can boast that all his needs are completely satisfied. It would be a dreadful, stodgy, and unprogressive world, if many people could.

Needs are usually classified under two headings: physical and emotional. Physical needs are few in number, and include such things as food, drink, air, a suitable temperature, and sleep. Emotional needs are not so easy to list, but in general they include importance, success, social approval, security, companionship, and understanding.

PHYSICAL NEEDS

To begin with the physical group, you will notice at once that several of them come within the field of economics: they depend on money for their proper satisfaction. Food, drink, and suitable temperature (clothing and

shelter) have for the most part to be bought and paid for. They are not free in the sense that air and sleep are free.


Obviously, physical needs must be satisfied if life is to be maintained. What, then, of the adjustments necessary to their satisfaction? Consider for a moment. How much of our behaviour—our thought, our work, our invention—is directed to the one end of serving our physical needs? How much of the world's total effort is devoted to this essential purpose? To be a bit more personal, what per cent of your own behaviour has to do with eating, drinking, and keeping comfortable? It is probably greater than you imagine. And it requires no prophet to tell you that when you embark on a career it will be greater still.

For centuries men have puzzled their heads over this question of physical needs. One school of thought has held that we should gratify them to the full. Another has held that we should subdue them as much as possible. It is a nice point for discussion. Gratifying them to the full has the grave disadvantage of increasing their number and their strength, and of producing fat and flabby bodies. Subduing them as much as possible takes away much of our pleasure, and tends to cut down our reserves of energy. What then? It seems that here, as in most places, the middle path is best.

EMOTIONAL NEEDS

Emotional needs are of a different sort. Where the denial of physical needs results in illness or death, the denial of emotional needs results in misery; where frustration of the first destroys the body, frustration of the second destroys the mind. For there can be no genuine and lasting happiness if our emotional needs are unsatisfied.

Let us look at them in some detail, because they are well worth understanding. Indeed, unless we understand them, we shall make no progress in our study of human nature.



First, there is importance. This may be called 'significance', or 'prestige', but whatever it is called, we are miserable without it. We cannot bear to be mere nothings in the world, and we will go to great lengths to make our personal importance felt. A few facts will make the point clear. What about your day-dreams? In how many of them do you become a great and impressive figure? There is no need to answer—your self-conscious look has given you away! Again, why do people lie and boast and bully? In most cases, these are just efforts to gain prestige. Think of the fish stories you have heard, the accounts of marvellous exploits in sport, the recital of dangerous adventures. What is the bully but a poor creature who has to build up his sense of importance by dominating someone weaker than himself? And so on, and so on. If you wish to hold a friend, you had better give him credit for his real talents and abilities. If you do not do so, he is more than likely to attach himself to someone who will.

Second, success. You will realize at once that success is

the chief way of gaining importance. Hence our demand for it. Lack of success in one direction almost invariably produces great effort in another. The clumsy boy, who is useless on the field of sport, takes to hard academic study, or devotes himself to the arts, or goes in for stamp-collecting. The dull scholar looks for success in athletics, or in manual activity, or in being an intolerable nuisance to his teachers. The plain girl becomes a career-woman, or pays great attention to dress, or sets up as a critic of manners and conduct.

Success of one sort or another we must have. If we are continually denied it, we acquire an inferiority attitude—with unfortunate results that will be dealt with in a later chapter. The thing to do is find out, as early in life as possible, our aptitudes and capacities, and develop them to the full. We must at all costs avoid becoming round pegs in square holes. There are far too many such in the world already.

Third, the approval of our family and friends. This is an imperative need—far greater than you imagine at first sight. Unless we have the approval of our fellows, we are poor indeed; we are in danger of becoming social outcasts, condemned and despised by all and sundry.

Society, for the best of reasons, is forever trying to make us similar to itself. It surrounds us with conventions of speech, manners, conduct, and taste. When we do not conform to these conventions, it disciplines us in a variety of rigorous ways. When we do conform, it gives us both approval and support.

How much do you think public approval is worth to you? When you lose it, as doubtless you sometimes do, are you your usual smiling and happy self? Of course not. The fact of the matter is that you are willing to do anything in reason to reinstate yourself and recapture your popularity.

To take another view of the matter, how many modes of behaviour do you adopt so as to retain the good will of your own crowd? Do you by any chance copy their dress, follow their interests, and use their picturesque speech? Why do you do it? Because you have no wish to be an outsider; because you want them to accept you and treat you as one of themselves. You do it because their approval is necessary to your happiness.

Here is a point for discussion. How should you behave when you are a member of two groups with conflicting standards? The question is a very practical one, for in many cases our family and our friends do not see eye to eye in such matters as good English, good manners, good music, and personal liberty. Should you behave differently in each group, or should you somehow develop standards of your own?

Fourth, security. This need is highly complex. It includes the following things at least: food and shelter; safety of life and limb; protection of one's reputation; and, in the case of adults, steady and remunerative employment.

Much human behaviour, especially on the part of nations, can be traced to the satisfaction of this need. Many times in the course of history, people have exchanged liberty for what they regarded as security. The exchange has rarely been a good one. On the other hand—and this is something we see very clearly today—there are people, cast in a finer and sterner mould, who willingly give up security in order that the liberty of their country may be maintained.

Yet, within a nation, universal security is a great and worthy goal. Indeed, it is being proclaimed as a democratic right. We look forward with high hope to the day when starvation and exposure will be things of the past, and every grown person will be assured of suitable employment.

Fifth, companionship. There can surely be no argument

about the strength of this. Not only must we have companionship but we must have it in all its degrees, from the deepest and most permanent relationships to the most casual. Family ties, one or two intimate friends, a host of acquaintances—these make up the pattern of a balanced life.

It is worth noting that punishment—which is nothing but the deliberate frustration of needs—is most rigorous when it deprives a man of companionship. Solitary confinement is said to be the hardest punishment, short of hanging, that a criminal can receive. A lesser illustration of the same fact is found in English Public Schools, where a boy who violates the accepted code of behaviour is 'sent to Coventry' by his fellows—no one, that is to say, is permitted to speak to him.

You are probably thinking, as you read this, that people do exist who prefer to be alone. Misanthropes, we call them. They live in remote and solitary places, and seem happiest in their own company. It is true enough. There are such people. But they are the exceptions that prove the rule. They were not like that from the beginning of life; they became misanthropic because of cruel and bitter experience at the hands of those they originally loved and trusted.

Sixth and last, understanding. This is a need that has sometimes been called 'curiosity'—the need to know. It can be seen in small children, who are never done asking questions; in all interested students; and also in the research worker, who devotes his life to some line of inquiry.

Probably the basis of understanding is the need for security. What we do not know is potentially dangerous, what we know is rarely a cause of fear. Recall, for example, that evening you spent alone in a strange house. You were sitting contentedly reading a book when an eerie sound fairly made you shiver. But after a while you were brave enough to go

out and investigate. When you found the source of the sound—the door of an old barn creaking with every gust of wind—you went back to your book with perfect ease of mind.

The need for understanding goes, of course, far beyond the allaying of fear. Every advance we have made in the control of natural forces has strengthened it. Today it is the rock on which our whole civilized life is built. It is our main hope for the future. All our science and all our arts are derived from it; and without it we should be like little children playing round the idle machines of a disused factory.

ADJUSTMENT

Having now examined the chief needs of man, both physical and emotional, we are in a position to return to the question of adjustment. Here again are the basic ideas set down at the beginning of the chapter: all behaviour is adjustive; all adjustment is carried out in service of needs.

Let us look first of all at the way in which our adjusting is done. An illustration or two will make the process plain. You are down town and realize from inside information it is time for a meal. You begin to look round for a suitable place to eat; you are immediately alive to everything that suggests a restaurant. The first one you find has a rather fly-bitten appearance, and you decide against it; the second is too expensive. You search on. In due time you find what seems to be the right spot and go in. You read the menu thoughtfully, savouring various foods in your mind, and considering prices. Soon a good meal is before you. You proceed to eat it. Hunger disappears, and you are comfortable again.

Here is another case. There is a fellow you admire and would like to have for a friend, but he does not seem to return the interest. You try him out in a variety of ways.

You discuss the latest policy of the students' council with him; you mention an unusually good movie you have seen; you start an argument about one of the teachers—but all in vain. Then you try a new tack and describe the joys of model aeroplane construction as carried on in your basement. He has no urge to construct model aeroplanes. What now? You invite him to your home and take him on at a hard game of table-tennis. Success at last! Table-tennis is something you have in common. He comes for more, and the friendship you want is definitely begun.

Let us analyse the process. It begins with an unsatisfied need which produces uncomfortable tension. You try out, one after another, a number of ways in which the need may be satisfied and the tension reduced. After considerable trial and error you find a way that succeeds. You use it, the tension disappears, and you are back once more to a comfortable state.

This is what happens all the time in all behaviour. Everything we do is intended to bring us a little more into harmony with our environment. Even the foolish things we do result from the same intention; and often we do things from sheer habit that were useful some time in the past but are now valueless—and may be a handicap.

Mannerisms are a capital example of this last point. Here is a common case. A certain man is an easy and practised speaker. He appears on the platform often, has an excellent command of English, and knows what he is talking about. But he never rises to speak without thrusting both hands in his coat pockets and straining his coat completely out of shape. What adjustive value can such a ridiculous mannerism have? The answer is a simple one. When he was learning to speak he was nervous; he was in such a state of tension that his hands visibly trembled. So he put them out of sight in his coat pockets, and pressed them down to keep them

still. In course of time the action became a habit, and he still does it in spite of the fact that he is nervous no longer.

You can think of a dozen illustrations that have come within your own observation. Every human action has a cause, and that cause is some unsatisfied need. Adjustment is the process by which we satisfy needs and reduce tensions.

CHAPTER 3

THE PHYSICAL MEANS OF ADJUSTMENT

SINCE adjustment is the explanation of behaviour, it becomes desirable for us to know something about the bodily equipment by means of which adjustments are made. What do we have in our bodies to enable us to satisfy our needs?

Three parts are concerned in this task: sense organs; nerve structure; muscles and glands. The sense organs are a receiving apparatus, informing us chiefly about conditions in the outside world. The nerve structure connects the brain (which, of course, is part of it) with sense organs on the one hand and with muscles and glands on the other. The muscles and glands are organs of response, and it is through them we produce most of our behaviour.

Now it would be quite easy to write a hundred pages on this physiological subject, but such a treatment is not necessary to our present purpose. The fundamental facts are all we require to know—just what will be enough for an understanding of human nature. No more, no less. For the sake of clearness, each part of the bodily mechanism of adjustment will be considered briefly by itself.

SENSE ORGANS

In spite of all popular notions to the contrary, we have ten sense organs and not five. Each one of them is an avenue of valuable information. They may be named and described as follows:

1. The eye, through which we receive all visual impressions regarding the environment.

2. The ear, which is a vibratory organ specialized for the reception of sound.
3. The nose, in which are tiny cells that are sensitive to gases, thereby supplying our sense of smell.
4. The tongue, on the surface of which are taste-buds that are chemically affected by sweet, salt, sour, and bitter, and so give us our sense of taste.
5. The semicircular canals in the inner ears, which are the source of our sense of balance.
6. Corpuscles on the surface of the body that are sensitive to heat.
7. Corpuscles on the surface of the body that are sensitive to cold.
8. Corpuscles everywhere that are sensitive to pressure.
9. Free-branched nerve-endings everywhere, that send us the danger-signal of pain.
10. Nerve-endings in muscles, tendons and joints, that inform us of muscular stresses and bodily positions.

Such are the sense organs of the body, and a few comments on some of them may be in order. Please do not regard these comments as in any way a full treatment of the subject, but merely as an informal effort to throw a little light on interesting places.

Sight. First, the eye. As you know, light waves are received on the retina of the eye. The retina receptors, however, are of two kinds—rods and cones. The rods give us twilight vision and are useless to us in strong light. They also are quite insensitive to colour. The cones give us daylight vision, and colour-vision; they are useless when the light is dim. Some people have better cones than rods, others have better rods than cones. Thus there are people who drive their cars more efficiently at night than in the daytime.

Have you ever gone out of strong sunlight into the darkness of a movie-theatre? If you have, you will remember your embarrassing blindness. Perhaps you stumbled over

several pairs of feet and sat unexpectedly in somebody's lap. Then, a moment or so later, you saw quite clearly, and wondered how you could have been so awkward. What is the explanation? Just this. When you came into the dim light, your cones ceased to function; and your rods were still out of commission due to the sunshine. After a few moments, your rods recovered in the dim light, and you were able to see.

An oddity of vision has to do with inability to distinguish between red and green. This is the commonest kind of colour-blindness. The oddity lies in the fact that it afflicts ten times as many men as women: one man in twenty-five suffers from it, but only one woman in two hundred and fifty. One of nature's little jokes!

A point worth remembering about colour, is that every colour tends to cast a band of its complementary around its edge. This explains why colours that appear to harmonize when at a little distance from each other, may clash violently when brought close together. The problem is not hard to work out in particular cases. Awareness of the fact mentioned is of real importance in the selection of colours for costume or interior-decorating.

Hearing. To come now to the sense of hearing, three things are worth mentioning here. The highest note that can be heard by the human ear is one of about thirty thousand vibrations per second. Dogs go some ten thousand vibrations higher, and are able to hear sounds inaudible to us. Does this cast any light on the claim that dogs have a 'psychic sense', which makes them mysteriously aware of occurrences hidden from us?

There is a great difference between people in the ability to discriminate pitch. Some are so gifted as to discriminate within one two-hundredth of a tone; others (about seven per cent of the population, we are told) can barely dis-

tinguish one note from another. Tests have been devised to measure this ability. It would be a very good thing for all of us if every small boy's pitch discrimination were to be carefully measured before he is permitted to play the violin.

'Perfect pitch'—the ability to recognize any note, or to produce any note at will—is rather rare. It is usually found only among highly gifted musicians, and is regarded by the rest of us as closely related to magic.

Taste. To go on to taste, we have here a sense very few people understand. According to laboratory experiment, we have four tastes and four only—sweet, sour, salt, and bitter. What then about the numerous and varied flavours we enjoy in our food? The answer is that taste is one thing and flavour another. Flavour is a combination of taste with smell—not to speak of effects due to temperature and pressure.

This is perhaps enough in the way of comment on the sense organs, but you must understand that the surface of the subject has hardly been scratched. If you should be moved to do a little outside reading, you would find many other things to arouse your interest.

NERVE STRUCTURE

The nerve structure has often been likened to a telegraph system or a telephone exchange, and it has a great deal in common with both. Every part of the body is connected up with the brain. Millions of nerve fibres come in from the sense organs, and millions of fibres go out to the muscles and glands. The brain is the great centre of control, receiving information, interpreting it, and setting off the responses necessary to adjustment. The neural impulse passes along the fibres in much the same way that electricity passes along a wire, but very much more slowly. Its speed,

however, is quite sufficient for the purpose. Also, the nerve fibres, which often run side by side in cables, are insulated much as electrical wires are, so that the impulse cannot escape along the sides.

We shall proceed in this book on the theory that nerve fibres are connected up in what are called neural arcs, in particular lines of communication running from sense organs to organs of response. This is by no means the only theory of behaviour that is held, but it is the simplest and most explanatory. When such an arc is established, then a certain sensory stimulation will set off a certain muscular or glandular reaction. Many of these neural arcs are established and operating when we are born; many more are connected up as we go through life.

Perhaps a few examples will help. If the palm of a baby's hand is pressed, the baby will immediately clasp the hand; if his eyelid is touched, he will immediately blink the eye. These reactions are found in all normal babies. The behaviour is due to the fact that neural arcs are present at birth connecting up pressure sensations on palm and eyelid with muscles that produce grasping in the one case and blinking in the other.

As an illustration of a neural arc not established at birth but connected up at a later time, consider any item in the multiplication table. When the sound 'seven times nine' is presented to the ear, the response 'sixty-three' is at once produced by the muscles of the throat. At least it ought to be! When it is unfailingly produced, we know that the neural arc has been well and truly made.

Neural arcs established at birth do not go through the brain—as a result they operate apart from our control. Most new arcs, however, are linked with the brain while they are being set up; but after they are thoroughly established, they operate without much interference on the part of the brain.

They are then the basis of habit, which as you know is practically automatic.

One thing more. We have a second nervous system, not nearly so familiar to us as the central nervous system. This is called the autonomic, and it controls the great organs of life—the heart, lungs, stomach, and so on. One part of it, the sympathetic division, produces those tensions in the great organs that we feel as various forms of excitement. When we are angry, for instance, the sympathetic division is busy. It is speeding up heart-beat and breathing, and arresting digestion. But of this, more later on.

ORGANS OF RESPONSE

The organs of response are our muscles and glands. By them we make our adjustments to the environment, because sensation and thought lead finally to action.

Muscles. There is no need to say much about the muscles on the outside of the body. These three things will be enough: they act in balanced pairs (like biceps and triceps), thus giving grace and control to our movements; they operate on the principle of the lever, all three classes of lever being represented in our bodies; and they possess 'tonus' or elasticity, which is closely related to our feeling of general well-being.

On the inside of the body are muscles that form the walls of the internal organs. It is tension in these muscles—under control of the sympathetic division—that produces the sensations of emotion. Also, the inner muscles are subject to definite rhythms—as in heart-beat, breathing rate, and stomach movements in digestion. When it is remembered that these very muscles have to do with emotion, it is not difficult to see the strong relationship between rhythm and excitement—modern music and dancing bring it very clearly out.

Duct Glands. Glands also are organs of response, though they are not very frequently recognized as such. The action of muscles is somehow more obvious than the action of glands. Yet there can be no mystery about the flow of tears in response to pain, or the flow of saliva in response to food. The truth is that the behaviour of our so-called 'duct glands' is not only fairly visible, but it throws a great deal of light on our state of mind. Why, for instance, is a glass of water usually placed on the table before a speaker? Is it because he will be thirsty? Not at all. It is because the excitement of speaking may stop the flow from his salivary glands, and put him out of business. Some speakers we know should never be supplied with water!

Endocrine Glands. There is, however, a second set of glands called 'endocrines'. Such glands as the thyroid, the adrenals, and the pituitary are in this group. They are within the body or the brain, and they deliver their very powerful secretions right into the blood-stream. They cannot be dealt with properly in this book, but here are a few brief notes on what some of them do.

The thyroid—visible in cases of goitre—speeds up our bodily processes, and holds down our weight. The adrenals reinforce the action of the sympathetic division by pouring adrenalin into our blood-stream when we are angry or afraid. The pancreas produces insulin, which enables us to use up our bodily sugar supply. Laboratory manufacture of insulin has saved the lives of thousands who suffer from diabetes. The pituitary regulates growth—its over-activity leads to gigantism and its under-activity to dwarfism.

All in all, the study of endocrines is one of the most fascinating in the world. Some day, when you have an opportunity, you should devote a little time to it.

Such then is our physical equipment for making adjustments. The sense organs inform us of the situation in which we are placed; the nervous system transmits and interprets the information; and the muscles and glands respond accordingly, by their movements and secretions.

One more illustration in closing. A man crossing the street is suddenly in danger of being run down by a speeding automobile. What occurs? His ears and eyes make him aware of the danger. They also inform him of the distance and speed of the on-rushing car, and of his own position in relation to it. His brain co-ordinates the messages from his sense organs, makes a quick decision, and issues an urgent command to his muscles and glands. By an immediate surge of energy—partly supplied by his adrenal glands—his muscles take him out of the danger zone. Then he wipes the sweat from his forehead and breathes a deep sigh of relief. There may also be a sequel to the story in which he expresses his opinion of the driver, or reports him to the police, or writes a letter to the newspapers. Sense organs, nervous system, muscles and glands—they have all done their part in making the adjustments necessary to saving his life and relieving his feelings.

CHAPTER 4

REFLEXES AND EMOTIONS

You will recall that in the last chapter something was said of neural arcs, and they were then strongly recommended to your attention. You will recall too that neural arcs are of two kinds: those established and operating at birth, and those established at a later date through learning. This chapter deals with the first kind—which have been given the names of reflexes and emotions—and it will discuss them in that order.

REFLEXES

There are many reflexes in the human body—some sixty-six in all—and most of them have a protective value. It would be difficult, however, to argue that they all have this. Blinking and hand-withdrawal and coughing are clearly protective, but one would be hard put to it to show the protective value of trembling and blushing.

Certain things, nevertheless, are common to all reflexes. They are all exceedingly rapid—in the majority of cases they are more rapid than anything we learn to do. They are frequent in occurrence. Nearly all of them affect only a small part of the body. They are very hard indeed to modify.

Let us consider a few reflexes in order to throw a little light on their social importance. The following have been selected in a quite arbitrary way for brief discussion: hand-withdrawal, smiling, frowning, weeping, yawning, blushing, and vocalizing. They may be regarded as good samples of reflexes in general.

Hand-withdrawal is clearly protective. It is the instant removal of the hand from a painful situation, from a hot stove, from the nip of a closing door, from the prick of a needle. We act long before we think: the hand is withdrawn and we consider the matter afterwards. The neural arc is there, and the impulse simply travels over it.



Smiling is our natural response to feelings of pleasure or approval. In early life it takes place quite without conscious effort. But as life goes on it becomes greatly modified by experience. We learn not to smile at the wrong times and in the wrong places; and we learn to smile when we are neither pleased nor approving. Smiling thus gets away from its original reflex basis, and comes under control of the brain. It is a reaction of enormous social importance—used very often as a way of influencing other people—and its sincerity declines.

Almost exactly the same may be said of frowning, which is originally a response to feelings of displeasure or disapproval. It comes to be used as a social lever, and loses some of its value as indicating the mental state of the individual.

Weeping is a reflex response to grief or pain, and is also seen in its most natural form among children. We are taught to repress our tears—‘to keep a stiff upper lip’, as the saying goes. Now although no one in his senses would encourage people to weep either frequently or publicly, there is nevertheless a real benefit to be had from it on some occasions.

When grief is wellnigh intolerable—as in bereavement—weeping helps to reduce tension, and thereby enables the sufferer to keep his mental balance. There are, however, some very different uses to which tears are often put: to win sympathy, to avoid punishment, to coerce other people, and to advance personal interests. Many people weep a good deal too easily for our comfort and their own sincerity. It would be an excellent thing if they could be discouraged.

The reflex of yawning is touched off in two main ways: by fatigue, and by boredom. Fatigue and boredom are of course related to each other, the former disappearing only in the face of a great incentive, and the latter yielding to a small one. Socially, however, yawning is nearly always taken to imply boredom, and for that reason is regarded as a discourtesy. So we make strenuous and sometimes unavailing efforts to suppress our yawns. But original arcs are very compelling, and every once in a while we are caught in a social error.

Blushing is a reflex fairly well beyond the bounds of human control. More's the pity! It indicates embarrassment, and harms no one so much as the person concerned. It is of interest, however, to note—though the fact brings little comfort—that the causes of embarrassment change as we grow older. A thing that made you blush furiously five years ago may only make you smile today. But do not congratulate yourself too soon! There are things that embarrass you today that would have had no such effect five years ago. One point more. Blushing is no certain indication of guilt, as some people imagine: one may blush for the shame of being accused.

Vocalizing, the ability to produce vocal sounds, is present at birth—very much so, as anyone knows who is acquainted with babies. Our main interest in vocalizing is that speech develops from it. It is a reflex that can be greatly modified,

being originally much the same in all babies, but capable of development into any language. It is rather a startling thought that, with a different social setting, you might now be talking Chinese or Hindustani instead of English. But you might—and very fluent Chinese or Hindustani too.

Speech comes to us slowly. By the age of twelve months the average baby has just a few words; at the age of eighteen months he can put together a few two-word sentences; but it is not till he is two years old that he can talk with any freedom. Little girls, by the way, talk earlier than little boys—their general development is faster.

You must not imagine, however, that up to the age of two or thereabouts, babies are satisfied with the small vocabulary they have acquired. They are extremely vocal, and fill in the gaps in real language with a fairly continuous form of expression known as babbling. They utter, that is to say, a series of meaningless sounds that resemble true speech.

One sometimes wonders if babbling ever dies out! So many people use language itself in endless and almost meaningless profusion.

EMOTIONS

All babies are born able to be angry, able to be afraid, able to love. These are abilities that depend on neural arcs that are already established. But no baby is born angry with, fearing, or loving anything. The objects of anger, fear, and love—with a very few exceptions—are still to be found. In the course of life, many new arcs will be built up that have to do with them, and this topic will be dealt with in the chapter on conditioning.

Emotion is a state of excitement. It is felt in the great organs that occupy the trunk of the body. It is set off, therefore, by the stimulation of neural arcs connected with the autonomic system, which controls the great central

organs. The brain has very little to do with the matter. This is a fact you know from your own experience, and which explains your frequent helplessness to arrest emotion by an effort of will. Emotion interferes with thought far more easily than thought interferes with emotion. It is a commonplace that the excited man is apt to think very queerly indeed.

Illustrations of this are distressingly easy to find. Do you remember, for instance, some of the cruelly unreasonable things you said last time you had a quarrel? Have you noticed that subjects apt to arouse emotion, such as economics, politics, and religion, can rarely be discussed in a rational way? Are you able to think quite straight about someone you dislike? Is it true that people are far more effectively roused to action by impassioned oratory than by convincing argument? The questions practically answer themselves.

There are a few—a very few—things that touch off emotion in new-born babies. Pain, and neglect of bodily needs will occur to your mind at once. The others can be set down in an exceedingly short list. Anger can be aroused by holding the baby so that he cannot move; fear can be aroused by a loud noise or by the sensation of falling; love—or its simplest expression—can be aroused by nursing and caressing. All the other emotional responses we make in later life are learned.

It is a curious fact—and one with which you will probably not agree at first sight—that fear and anger are closely related. The bodily changes occurring in fear and anger are exactly the same; only the mental experiences are different. Fear-anger is a state of tension in the great central organs—due, of course, to action of the autonomic system—and it is marked by physical events of which the most important can be listed as follows:

1. The heart beats faster.

2. The blood-pressure rises.
3. The blood coagulates more easily, thus reducing bleeding.
4. The breathing becomes quicker and shallower.
5. The salivary glands dry up.
6. The digestion is arrested.
7. Sweat breaks out on the body.
8. Sugar is released from the liver, thus increasing energy.
9. Fatigue products are more rapidly removed from the muscles.

If you think these changes carefully over, you will hardly fail to see they form a pattern. Each one of them does something to prepare the body for a physical emergency. They add up to a sudden surge of energy and speed, and have an obviously protective value. They must have been of tremendous service to primitive man, living as he did in continual danger. They are far less useful to ourselves, who live for the most part in physical safety. Consider each of them in turn, and fit it into the emergency pattern. Why, for instance, is digestion arrested? Because energy taken up by digestion is urgently needed by the muscles. Why does sweat break out? So as to check too great a rise in temperature—and perhaps to make the body more slippery. Why does the blood coagulate more easily? Because the emergencies of primitive man often resulted in wounds.

It should be noted here that the adrenal glands help greatly in bringing about these changes. In the face of an emergency they pour adrenalin into the blood stream, and so reinforce the action of the autonomic system.

From the point of view of civilized life, what does all this mean? It means that every time we are angry or afraid, nature prepares us for vigorous action. We find ourselves in a state of high tension and increased strength. The trouble is that physical action is generally out of the ques-

tion: we cannot fly at someone's throat or run suddenly away. We have to stew in our own seething juice! And this is one of the hardest things society compels us to do.

By what civilized methods can we reduce the tension? The most commonly used are verbal abuse and sarcasm—poor things both. The best plan is probably to go off and do something that calls for strong physical exertion, such as tackling the wood-pile, or digging the garden, or playing baseball.

Now although strength is enormously increased by fear-anger emotion, it is nevertheless a serious handicap to the carrying out of any skilled activity. Bodily co-ordinations are less exact: the fine edge of expertness is dulled. The player who loses his temper in a basket-ball game goes right off his shooting; even the boxer, when he becomes angry, is inaccurate in his timing and his judgment of distance. The essence of skill is coolness and self-control.

There are some situations, however, in which a small amount of excitement is probably an advantage. Public speaking or public performance of almost any kind is a case in point. Mild excitement lends colour and sometimes even brilliance to the performer; it makes him less calm and matter-of-fact. And his controlled excitement renders him more exciting to his audience.

So far we have been discussing fear and anger as if they were one and the same thing, as indeed they are from the physical point of view. They are very different, however, from the mental point of view, and to this we must now turn.

It would seem that the mental reactions are the result of experience. In every emergency situation, there are two things we can do: we can fight or we can run away—we can struggle or we can give in. At the beginning of life we struggle, and if struggling continually succeeds for us, we

meet all similar situations with the reaction of anger. But where struggling has continually failed for us, we react to similar situations with fear.

Take the case, for example, of a boy who has almost always been successful in his fights with other boys. An insult or a blow arouses him to sudden anger. The outcome is quite opposite in the case of a boy who has continually been beaten: an insult or a blow awakens not anger but fear. The situations these two boys face are the same; but because of differences in their experience, their mental reactions are different.

Here is a question that may make the point clear. Have you noticed how quickly you sometimes change from anger to fear or from fear to anger? Imagine yourself sleeping alone in a small shack back in the mountains. You are awakened by the sound of a heavy body rubbing against the wall, and your mind leaps to the idea of a bear. All you have ever learned about bears leads you to believe you are in a hopeless position, and you become horribly afraid. But your state of tension is such that you cannot lie still. You creep to the window, and see—old Mr. Ogden's cow. Suddenly you are angry, and rush out with loud yells to drive it away. Your experience, you see, had given you no encouragement to contend with bears, but it had taught you that you can deal victoriously with cows.

SIGNS OF EMOTION

One very practical matter remains to be considered—the ways in which we can perceive the emotional condition of another person. Human beings usually try to hide their emotions from us, and it is sometimes important—for their sakes and our own—that we should see behind the mask. Here, then, are some symptoms to look for. When two or

three of them occur together, there is little doubt emotion has been aroused in the person who exhibits them:

1. Changes in colour—due of course to changes in blood-flow.
2. Differences in breathing and speech.
3. Moistening of the lips—due to failure of salivary glands.
4. Beads of perspiration, when the temperature is cool.
5. Trembling and muscle-twitching.
6. Illogical or exaggerated talk.
7. 'Jitter-reactions', such as whistling, beating with the foot, fiddling with some object, or moving restlessly about.

These symptoms are well worth remembering. If you can recognize them and act accordingly, you will be much better off in social relationships.

CHAPTER 5

INTELLIGENCE

NO MEASURABLE thing marks man more sharply off from the lower animals than does his intelligence. He has three great advantages over them: flexible hands, highly developed speech, and far higher intelligence—but without his superior intelligence he could neither direct the activities of his hands nor develop his language. Man's conquest of brute creation, and his ever-increasing control of natural forces, are chiefly due to his intellectual power.

Intelligence is not easy to define. Perhaps as useful a definition as any is this: Ability to solve the problems of life. The intelligent person is one who can bring his past experience to bear upon the situations of today, and by doing so can handle himself and his affairs with confidence and success. He is one who learns things easily, understands them clearly, remembers them tenaciously, and applies them wisely.

Intelligence depends on the quality of the brain, and especially of the cortex or outer layer of the brain. Thus, since our structure (including the brain) is inherited from our ancestors, it follows that intelligence is a matter of heredity. Bright parents are likely to have bright children, and dull parents dull ones. When we look into the matter of heredity in a later chapter, this point will be more fully discussed.

In general, the intelligence of an individual cannot be increased. Efforts to increase it by improving the environment have been very disappointing. Such an improvement

seems to do no more than give the intelligence additional material to work with; it does not raise the intelligence itself. There are some cases, of course, in which intelligence is low because of defective bodily condition—as, for example, a poor thyroid gland—and in these it may be raised by proper treatment of the defect, but such cases are very few. You may take it as fairly definite that you must make the best of whatever intelligence you now have.

You will have seen, however, that intelligence develops with age up to a certain point; that a child of six can solve problems he would have been quite unable to solve when he was two. It has been found by experiment that intelligence advances proportionately with age during the first sixteen years of life. When sixteen is reached, there is no further development. A boy of sixteen has all the problem-solving power he will ever have; what he will acquire from then on will be more and more information. That is a thought that may take you rather aback!

Intelligence can now be measured scientifically, as you probably know. It is done by giving an intelligence test, in which the subject—yourself perhaps—is asked to solve a number of problems within a given time. His I.Q. or Intelligence Quotient is then worked out. It will be interesting to examine the ideas on which this calculation is based.

First, the problems of the test must come within the ordinary experience of the subject. They must have to do with things he is sure to have met in the course of his life. But each problem must be new to him, in the sense that he has never solved it before.

Second, scores normally made in the test by children at various age levels must be known. The examiner must know what the average child of six makes, what the average child of ten makes, what the average child of every age up to sixteen makes.

Now if a child of twelve obtains the score normally made by children of nine, his mental age is nine. His I.Q. is got by dividing his mental age by his actual age, and multiplying the quotient by one hundred to get rid of decimal places. In this case the calculation will be nine divided by twelve and multiplied by one hundred—with the result: I.Q.=75. If the subject is sixteen or over, the actual age is always taken as sixteen. Otherwise, dreadful results would occur!

You will note that the normal I.Q. is 100, the result reached when mental age and actual age are the same. Needless to say, the great majority of people have I.Qs. that cluster about this point on the scale. You should note, however, there is a wide range: some I.Qs. are below 20, and others reach 200.

Here are the percentages of the population found at the various I.Q. levels:

<i>I.Qs.</i>	<i>Percentages</i>	<i>Descriptions</i>
130 and up	1	Gifted
120 - 129	5	Very superior
110 - 119	14	Superior
90 - 109	60	Normal
80 - 89	14	Dull normal
70 - 79	5	Borderline
69 and down	1	Feeble-minded

Feeble-minded people, as you see from the table, have I.Qs. of 69 or less, but you must be careful about making a judgment on this single basis. Exact lines are very hard to draw where human nature is concerned, and it has been found that occasionally a person with an I.Q. below 69 is not feeble-minded. In the main, however, the line of division holds good.

The feeble-minded are usually classified in three groups: morons, imbeciles, and idiots—the morons being at the top

and the idiots at the bottom. Imbeciles and idiots are more a care than a nuisance to society. Morons on the other hand, unless they are carefully trained and supervised, can be a social problem of the most difficult sort. It is from their ranks a great many of our hopeless criminals and vagrants come. The chief fact about them is that they are unable to plan and reason effectively for themselves. They need to live in a simple environment, to do work that makes no demands on the intellect, and to be continually guided by other people.

Much investigation has been done to discover the I.Qs. necessary for success in various occupations, and many such have been worked out. You will be able to find the exact figures in any standard book on applied psychology. In general, they are just what we would expect, with professional I.Qs. high up on the scale, and the I.Qs. of unskilled labourers at the lower end. It is a sensible thing to find out whether your own I.Q. is high enough to give you a good chance of success in the occupation you intend to enter. Incidentally it can be too high! If you enter an occupation that has no lasting challenge for your brains, you will become bored and miserable.

Now in closing, let us note two facts about intelligence it would be a good thing if everyone knew.

NO SEX SUPERIORITY IN INTELLIGENCE

First, there is no difference in intelligence between men and women: they make parallel scores on all intelligence tests. No doubt the boys would like to argue this point! "Why is it," they will say, "that women have accomplished so little in the world? Why have men outdone them so completely not only in science but also in the arts?" Here are some answers. Until very recently, the education of women has been seriously neglected. Women have been trained to

a pattern of so-called 'ideal womanhood' that has left them rather helpless. Women have always been more interested in home-making than in carving out careers. The world—political, economic, scientific, and artistic—has been controlled by men for thousands of years.

There is a great likelihood the future will be different. Women are now flocking into politics and science, into business and industry. They are demanding equal opportunities and an equal share of the world. But even so, it is doubtful that they will ever seriously challenge the leadership of men in these fields, because great numbers of them will always prefer home-making to a career.

NO RACE SUPERIORITY IN INTELLIGENCE

Second, we have little or no reason to believe that any race is superior to another in intelligence. Such differences as appear between races, when they are given intelligence tests, are probably due to the unsuitability of the tests themselves.

You will remember the statement that the problems in a test must come within the ordinary experience of the subject. Thus, when ordinary experience differs, as it does among different races, no single test is fair to all. To give the same test to children living in a large city and to children brought up in a tiny back-woods settlement is clearly wrong. There is no such thing as a universal intelligence test—each race, and indeed each group, must be tested with problems that come out of its own life.

There is a very simple way of making any race seem inferior to any other. All that has to be done is to give it a test suitable to the other and not to itself. But when each race is tested with problems related to its own life and experience, neither superiority nor inferiority can be shown. The notion that one race is more intelligent than another is not supported by the facts.

CHAPTER 6

HABIT

HABIT accounts for nine-tenths of our behaviour. It is the most useful, and in some respects the most dangerous, thing in life. Without habits, we should be as helpless as newborn babes; with habits so set that they cannot be modified, we are like men enchained. In a word, habits are splendid servants and dreadful masters.

To clear the ground for our discussion, there are seven facts about habit it is necessary you should know.

First, all habits are learned. We are born with no habits at all. To say we inherit a single one of them from our ancestors is to talk nonsense.

Second, all habits are successful ways of behaving—at the time we learn them. They work. They reduce tension by satisfying some need.

Third, all habits are established by attention and repetition. Neither attention without repetition, nor repetition without attention will bring the desired result.

Fourth, all habits are automatic. Once they are learned, no more attention is necessary. They are carried through with no mental effort whatever.

Fifth, habits are formed to take care only of such situations as frequently occur. We have habits for tying shoelaces, and handling forks, and reading books; but no habit for buying an automobile, or delivering a valedictory address, or getting married.

Sixth, habits are not only physical, but also mental and emotional. We have habits of thought (opinions and be-

liefs) and habits of feeling (preferences and dislikes) as well as habits of action.

Seventh, bad habits differ from good habits in just one respect: they reduce tensions, but create other tensions to take their place. The man, for example, who talks everybody down, may satisfy his need to dominate his audience and so reduce his immediate tension—but the upshot will be that everyone will dislike and avoid him, and tension will return to him in added strength.

With these seven facts in mind, we can go on to discuss habit in a more informal way. The main question is this: How does habit affect us in our personal and social life?

VALUE OF HABIT

There can be no doubt it is of enormous importance. To make this clear, imagine yourself waking up tomorrow morning with all your habits gone. You would be well back in your babyhood, unable to walk, or to talk, or to put on your clothes. You would have to do everything as if for the first time. Every thing, even the least, would be a problem. If you managed to get downstairs without breaking your neck, you would be a bit of a genius. Habits save our time and our energy—they make us efficient human beings.

Consider the matter of skill in sport. There is a game you have learned to play very well, and in which you automatically make certain skilled movements in certain situations. What would the loss of those skilled, automatic movements mean to you? It would set you back among the beginners, among the awkward squad. You would be an efficient player no more.

Good speech, good manners, good character—these are largely matters of habit. They are chiefly established when we are young; and they last, with modifications, as long as

we live. Early habits are strongest. Did you, for example, ever meet a man whose early English was bad, and who by trying hard had learned to speak grammatically? If so, did you notice that whenever he became excited, he was apt to slip back into his original way of speaking? We are like that. The only safe plan for going through life with the habits of a lady or a gentleman is to acquire them as soon and as thoroughly as possible.

Another advantage of sound habits is that they bring us freedom. They take automatic charge of all the routines of life, and free us to think of more interesting things. Bill Smith, for instance, is a truck-driver, who all day long must weave in and out through traffic. He is forever changing gears, speeding and slowing, starting and stopping. What kind of life would he lead if he had to devote his whole attention to every movement of his feet and hands? In that case he would be exhausted in a couple of hours.

But what actually happens? All the movements of ordinary driving are made automatically; he has to pay attention to them only when something unusual occurs. As a result his mind is relatively free. He can look about him a bit. He can think over his plans for the week-end, and even carry on a conversation if he has a companion.

So much for the value of habit. Let us now look at its one great drawback, the thing that may make its victim a helpless slave.

DANGERS OF HABIT

Few habits can remain satisfactory for a lifetime. Like our clothes, they have a way of becoming out of date. They are formed to serve our needs in a certain set of circumstances, and lose much of their value when needs and circumstances change. But it is their nature to be rather firmly fixed, and to remain with us even after they have

become obsolete. The older we grow, the more fixed they are, and the harder it is for us to change them. There are some pitiable people—fossils, we call them—who have not changed one opinion, or got rid of one prejudice, or varied one jot of their daily routine, any time in the last twenty years.

Now there are two excellent reasons why we must continually reorganize our habits: our needs change and so does the world in which we live.

First, our needs change. As we increase in age we acquire new needs and modify old ones. We do not remain the same for five months together. What would you think of a group of business-men playing marbles in their lunch-hour, or a group of young women devoting themselves to the care and superintendence of dolls? To take something less absurd, how would you regard a man who at the age of seventy still insisted on playing a feeble game of tennis?

Consider yourself. Are your interests and activities the same as they were five years ago? Have you acquired any new needs in that time? Are you doing things and discussing subjects that would not have appealed to you then? If not, you have fossilized rather early in life.

Second, the world changes. In fact, it changes more rapidly every year. Science and industry are seeing to that. New materials, such as plastics, are being discovered; new processes are being introduced; transportation and communication are being revolutionized; new ideas are everywhere appearing. Habits suited to the world of yesterday, are less suited to the world of today, and there is little doubt many of them will be wholly unsuited to the world of tomorrow.

These changes have an enormous effect on the arts, and particularly on music. Modern music, which has caught the strenuous tempo of the modern world, is utterly differ-



ent from the music of fifty years or so ago. Popular songs and popular dance music are excellent illustrations of this fact. The popular songs of fifty years ago were melodious, highly sentimental, and usually pathetic—in a great many of them somebody died! The first world war changed all that. Melody became steadily less and less important, and rhythm took its place. Tempo became faster to keep pace

with modern life. The sentimental and pathetic elements remained strong—and still remain strong, as anyone who listens to the crooners can bear witness.

Dance music of fifty years ago was melodious, often languorous, and at times even stately. It centred about such dances as the minuet and the waltz, which were excellently suited to the less athletic figures and the voluminous clothing of that day. After the coming of the first world war, people became more tense and demanded a more vigorous outlet in their dancing. Rhythm began to displace melody; speed increased. All manner of violent dances were introduced—from the one-step to the gymnastic footwork of the jitter-bug. It is needless to add that the latter is a release of tensions caused by world war number two.

Now consider how these rapid changes have marked off tastes of people of various ages. Musical tastes are habits, formed as other habits are, and are just as hard to modify. People who are now fifty, formed their musical tastes when

popular songs and popular dance music were much more melodious and much slower in tempo. They therefore tend to prefer melody to rhythm, and grace to speed. Crooners and jitter-bugs leave them entirely cold.

Their sons and daughters, on the other hand, have formed their musical tastes in the world of today. They enjoy strong rhythms, queer intervals, and a fast tempo. They look on crooning as a form of art, and regard jitter-bugging as one of the last words in dancing.

The result of all this is that one part of the population has a dislike—and sometimes even a contempt—for the musical taste of the other part. Many a family, as you perhaps know, is hopelessly divided on the question of radio programmes. The elders formed their habits of musical enjoyment at a time now many years past, and in a world that has now changed almost out of recognition. The children formed their musical habits the day before yesterday, and in a world that still surges all about them. Who is right and who wrong?

It is a hard question to answer. The elders are wrong because they have not modified their musical habits to keep abreast of the changing world. But the children are also wrong if they think of their present taste in music as anything more than a passing phase. The world moves, and we must move with it. Music will change again—perhaps several times in the next fifty years. It will reflect conditions in the world, and the sensible man is he who can so modify his habits as to keep reasonably up to date. However, and this is worth noting—some music written in every period is infused with so much genius, it becomes immortal.

We come now to the last point in our inquiry: How can habits be changed? If they become out of date for the reasons given, what method can be used to alter them?

CHANGING OUR HABITS

Let us set off with an illustration. A certain boy—Arthur Morrison, we shall call him—has been brought up by his rather elderly parents in a remote place. His parents are very refined people, who take pride in using correct and literary English. Naturally enough, Arthur's habits of speech have been learned from them.

At the age of sixteen he comes to the city to attend high school, and at once finds himself different in speech from all the other boys. They laugh at his vocabulary and his ways of expressing himself. They consider him an oddity, and shut him out from their friendship.

What happens? Arthur is a bright fellow and he very soon realizes the cause of the trouble. He becomes highly conscious of his speech, thinking of each word before he says it. He listens to the language of his companions, and tries hard to learn it and use it. After a while, his constant attention and practice are successful. He builds up new habits of speech, and is accepted as one of the crowd. What becomes of his English, mark you, is something else again!

Let us analyse the process a little. The old habit is modified only when it no longer works. It is then brought back to attention and carefully examined in the light of the changed situation. Necessary alterations are made in it, and the reorganized habit is practised attentively until it becomes automatic.

Clearly, there is no real obstacle in the way of changing any habit we have—if we sincerely want to do it. Habits of thought, of feeling, and of muscular action can all be dealt with in the same way. No opinions, likings, or motion-patterns need to be permanent.

One note in closing. The world is changing today at a speed never reached before; and, so far as we can see, the

speed of change is likely to be increased. Ten years from now, our surroundings and the ways of satisfying our needs may be entirely different. Our habits, therefore, must be constantly examined and corrected.

CHAPTER 7

CONDITIONING

WE COME now to conditioning, one of the really fundamental principles of human nature—a principle just as important in this field as are the laws and principles you have learned in the field of physics or chemistry. If you understand conditioning—and there is no particular difficulty in doing so—you will greatly increase your insight into many kinds of behaviour that would otherwise be very puzzling.

Perhaps the best way to begin is to describe a few cases of behaviour due to conditioning. This will give you a good background for the more technical analysis that is to follow.

On a certain Manitoba farm, a lad of sixteen (who is an old man now!) used to do a big share of the ploughing. Since much of the farm work had to be done at a considerable distance from the house, his mother used to run up a flag to signify that dinner was ready. The lad, who had a healthy appetite—and who had some gnawings of hunger when meal-times were about due—would look in the direction of the flag-pole whenever he completed a furrow. The moment he saw the flag, his mouth began to water. The sight of a flag, that is to say, set off a strong response in his salivary glands.

Little babies are great crawlers, and they approach everything in their environment that comes within range of their senses. Here, then, is a baby who sees bright flames shooting up on the hearth, and hears the sharp crackle of the burning logs. What does he do? Just what every inexperienced


enced baby would do. He crawls forward to the fire and reaches out his little hand. Pain comes to him at once, and he draws back crying. Afterwards, he is careful not to approach the flames so closely. As the old saw has it: A burnt child dreads the fire.

A small boy called Jackie, who lived in poor circumstances with his grandmother, was taken by her to have dinner with some well-to-do friends. There was tongue on the table—a delicacy Jackie had never tasted before. He ate so much tongue that he was deathly sick for three days. He is a man now, but if you put tongue before him, his face turns grey and he has to leave the table.

To describe something a little nearer to yourself, have you ever taken a violent dislike to someone whom you have met for the very first time, and who has certainly done you no injury? Have you ever had a great deal of pleasure from some foolish little keepsake? Have you, at some time in your life, and for no obvious reason, detested some school subject? Are you afraid of the dark, or of thunder, or of snakes? Have you ever stood in a place for absolutely the first time, and felt you had stood in that very place before?

All these queer reactions, and a thousand more that resemble them, are the result of conditioning. You will realize the importance of a principle that explains so much. If you master this principle, you will leap ahead in your understanding of behaviour—both your own and that of others.


Conditioning was first investigated scientifically by Ivan Pavlov, a great Russian physiologist. He experimented on the salivary reflex of a dog, and started off from two facts applying to all normal dogs: first, a dog will salivate more strongly when mild acid is dropped on his tongue; and second, a dog will become alert when an electric bell is rung in his hearing. These two reactions are based on neural



arcs present and active from the beginning, in all normal dogs. Quite definitely they are not learned.


Now what will happen if the acid is dropped and the bell rung at the same time and on many occasions? A curious thing. After a while, the ringing of the bell *alone* will cause strong salivation. A new neural arc is established in the dog, connecting up his hearing with his salivary glands. He responds to the bell in a way he certainly did not do at the beginning.

The process can be shown by means of a diagram, using the letters S and R to represent 'stimulus' and 'response', and an arrow between them to represent the neural arc. The two original arcs can now be shown as follows:



Thus S_1 , the first stimulus or acid, sets off R_1 , the first response or salivation; and S_2 , the second stimulus or bell, sets off R_2 , the second reaction or alertness.

Now, if S_1 and S_2 occur a number of times *simultaneously*, as indicated by the bracket, a new connection is formed joining S_2 to R_1 . This connection can be shown by means of a dotted line:




Then $S_2 \longrightarrow R_1$ is a new neural arc, and the dog has learned to respond with salivation to the sound of a bell. (It may, incidentally, be noted that there will also be a new arc, $S_1 \longrightarrow R_2$, causing the dog to give an alertness response to the dropping of the acid.)


We may now set down a simple definition of conditioning. When two or more neural arcs are simultaneously active, there tends to be a connection set up between them, so that the stimuli come to set off new responses.

With this in mind, we are well able to explain the cases described at the beginning of the chapter, and it will be a useful exercise to do so. Each of them can be dealt with by means of a diagram.


First case:



Second case:



Third case:



So far we have been discussing the conditioning of reflexes, and another experiment will have to be described before we can clearly understand the conditioning of emotions. The other cases mentioned, which had to do with likings, dislikings, fears, and an odd sense of familiarity, come under this heading.


CONDITIONING OF EMOTION

The conditioning of emotion was scientifically investigated by John B. Watson, who used as his subject an eleven-month-old baby called Albert. You will recall that babies are originally afraid of only two things: a loud noise, and falling. The aim of the experiment was to create a new fear in Albert, namely, fear of a white rat.

The child was seated on a mattress placed on a table in the laboratory. Hanging from the ceiling was a piece of steel rail, which when struck with a hammer could be made to produce a sufficiently loud and horrible noise. Beside the steel rail stood Watson's assistant, hammer ready in his hand.

Try to visualize this unpleasant scene. The baby, full of confidence and crowing happily, is shown a white rat taken from the pocket of the experimenter's smock. He shouts with delight and reaches out his hands. The very moment the baby touches the rat, the steel rail is struck a heavy blow, and he starts in sudden terror. He is soothed and played with for a while—and then the episode is repeated. It is several times repeated, and after several days repeated again. With what final result? With the final result that Albert screams and trembles at the sight of a white rat.

Let us express all this in the form of a diagram:




But there is a great deal more to say. Albert, being a baby, was not able to discriminate one thing from another with any real clearness. So when he learned to fear a white rat, he also learned to fear everything that even remotely resembled a white rat—small furry animals, a woman's muff, even cotton-batting. He had learned to fear a host of objects not included in the experiment. The point is one you must remember.

We are now able to explain the other cases. First, there is the case of the person we dislike at first sight. Why? Because that person has something in common with someone we once had reason to dislike. Perhaps it is the shape of his nose, or the tilt of his head, or the tone of his voice, or his accent, or his walk, or the expression on his face. It may be anything whatever about him—like the baby, we are not very discriminating.

Look again at the case of Albert. An object having *anything in common* with the white rat produced fear after he was conditioned. So also in your case, any feature or characteristic of the person you originally disliked, may cause you to dislike another person who possesses it.

Again, why should a keepsake bring you pleasure? Simply because it once was *part* of a pleasurable situation. Because it tends to bring back the pleasant emotion you felt in that situation. Or, to put the matter differently, the keepsake occurred simultaneously with a person for whom you had a strong affection, and so has come to arouse an emotion similar to that aroused by the person.


Here is the diagram:




New Arc: $S_2 \text{ (School pin)} \longrightarrow R_1 \text{ (Strong pleasure)}$

The third case had to do with your detesting some school


subject—an unfortunate thing that occurs in too many students' lives. How is it to be explained? Surely the subject itself had very little to do with the matter. Let us diagram a few of the possible conditionings:



or:



or:




New Arc: $S_1 \text{ (Subject)} \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} R_2 \text{ (Boredom and resentment)}$

The fourth case concerned the acquiring of a new fear, and of course the Albert experiment shows just how this happens. It may be of interest, however, to see how a new fear can be acquired without intention on anyone's part.

A baby—who fears only a loud noise and falling—is left alone at night in his darkened bedroom. The window is open and the door has been left ajar. His parents go down the street for a few minutes to visit a friend's garden. While they are away the wind suddenly rises, and repeatedly bangs the door of the baby's room. After that night, the baby is terrified of being alone in the dark.

The diagram is as follows:



The last case is not nearly so simple, but the same principles apply. What is it that once in a long time gives us a strong sense of familiarity in what we know to be a wholly strange situation?

The answer is that several characteristics of the new situation are also present in some other situation with which we are familiar. If characteristics are represented by the letters A, B, C, D, etc., a diagram can be made.

Let us say the original situation was made up of the characteristics A, B, C, D, E, and F, and produced the response: sense of familiarity. Then each one of these, because it occurred simultaneously with the original situation, would tend to set off the same response. Now if several of these characteristics are found in the new situation—whose characteristics are, let us say, A, G, C, H, J, and F—then A, C, and F, which are common to both situations, would tend to produce the sense of familiarity response.

We stand, for example, at the top of a street we have never seen before. The street contains a great many buildings, but it chances there is a church with a square steeple on our right, a big rectangular department store farther down on our left, and an hotel with a dome a bit farther on again.

Now we are well acquainted with a street that has three rather similar buildings, rather similarly placed. The common characteristics arouse for the strange street the sense of familiarity we have for the other—and we cry out in amazement.

To return to ordinary cases of conditioning, here are a few more questions to consider. Have you noticed that certain smells, certain tunes, certain scenes, certain voices, and certain footsteps make you sad or gay, hopeful or depressed? Think back a little, and see where the conditioning arose. If a cheerful poem makes you gloomy, try to find out the

circumstances under which you made the acquaintance of that poem. If the smell of new-mown hay exhilarates you, it would be interesting to know why. Of one thing you may be sure—the answer will be connected with conditioning.


RECONDITIONING


This would be an unsatisfactory chapter if it did not point out how undesirable conditionings can be eliminated. Although conditioning helps us in a thousand ways—in our speech, in our manners, in our taste—there are also many results of conditioning that are a great handicap to our happiness and efficiency. Some of our fears are among the worst of these, as also are our prejudices and superstitions.

How would you like, for example, to be terrified of dogs, or to dislike all people with long noses, or to believe in a dreadful ogre that snatches people out of their beds? There are multitudes of people going about who have even worse fears and worse beliefs than these. What, if anything, can be done for such people?

The process of reconditioning is much like the process of conditioning, but with this difference: in conditioning, the neural arcs are original; in reconditioning, at least one of them has been acquired. Thus, fear of dogs, dislike of people with long noses, and belief in ogres are based on acquired neural arcs—on arcs set up by conditioning. When reconditioning is done, the stimulus that has come to arouse an undesirable response is combined with a stimulus that arouses a desirable one.


Let us follow the whole process through, point by point. First comes the undesirable conditioning:





Now comes reconditioning to eliminate the new and undesired arc. 'Dog' must occur simultaneously with something that arouses keen pleasure—as, for instance, 'food'. Care must be taken, however, to emphasize the stimulus 'food', and play down the stimulus 'dog', otherwise the child will be worse off than ever, and avoid his food!

Note now the reconditioning process:




New Arc: $S_1 (\text{Dog}) \longrightarrow R_2 (\text{Keen enjoyment})$

Reconditioning is always very difficult to bring about. In the above experiment, a small friendly dog should be used; it should invariably be present when the child has his meals; and it should be brought gradually nearer to him as the days pass. Several weeks will probably be required for the process. But another difficulty arises: the child was conditioned to fear all dogs, and the reconditioning may only

cause him to enjoy one dog. Other dogs may still arouse fear. It may be necessary to repeat the reconditioning process with a whole series of dogs, big and little, smooth and shaggy. And that is quite an undertaking.


The process, however, is sound and reasonably sure. In less severe cases it works very effectively and is well worth using. Let us in closing take the case of a boy who is conditioned against a certain accent.

The conditioning may have occurred as follows:



We will suppose the boy is keenly aware of the fact that he cannot go sensibly through life with a strong dislike for everyone who happens to have this particular accent. He therefore decides to cultivate the friendship of a very charming person who has it.

The reconditioning works out as follows:



You will realize, of course, that the pleasure aroused by the charming person must be great enough to overcome the dislike aroused by the accent.

CHAPTER 8

HOW MEANING ARISES

How does a word come to have its meaning? Does it have exactly the same meaning for all the people who use it? Can the meaning of a word develop and change in the mind of an individual? These are some of the questions this chapter will try to answer.

Meaning is obviously important. You can readily see that language itself depends on the fact that certain sounds (or words) have a reasonably similar meaning for those who use them. When a sound has different meanings—as it may have in different languages—then people who know only one are unable to communicate with people who know only the other.

How then does the meaning of a word arise? Instead of answering the question directly, let us start off with an illustration, and afterwards make our analysis.

Imagine yourself left in charge of a two-year-old child. It may be rather a dreadful thought, but bear with it! The child is hard to entertain, and seems very likely to break into a dismal howl. So you whip out your watch and dangle it before his eyes. He brightens up at once, reaches out his hands, clutches the watch, and probably tries to put it in his mouth. You rescue it in time and keep it dangling. He shouts with delight. You put it to his ear, and he listens intently. After a moment or two of this, you say "Watch!" and he says the word back to you. The word becomes part of the game. You pretend to put the watch away, and encourage him to say "Watch!" to make you bring

it out again. The day is saved, and a good time is had by both of you.


The following day you chance to meet the little chap on the street. He toddles up to you eagerly, and cries, "Watch!" What does he mean? Simply that he wants to repeat the experience of the previous afternoon. The sound has a meaning for him now, and represents to his mind a whole group of interesting sensations—the object's size and shape, its brightness, its hardness, its strange ticking, perhaps even its taste and its metallic smell. But it represents more than all this: it also represents the game you played and the keen pleasure he enjoyed.

We can now turn to the principle that explains the process. It is, of course, a form of conditioning, so with your knowledge of conditioning you will understand it easily.

Recall first that when two or more neural arcs are simultaneously active, there tends to be a connection built up between them. Recall second that any part of a situation can arouse the response originally made to the situation as a whole. In Pavlov's experiment these two things are clearly seen: first, the arc S_1 (Acid) \longrightarrow R_1 (Salivation) is connected up with the arc S_2 (Bell) \longrightarrow R_2 (Alertness); and second, either part of the original situation, acid or bell, comes to arouse the whole original reaction, salivation plus alertness.

Let us apply these principles in the case of the baby and the watch. Here, of course, since this was a real life happening and not a controlled experiment, far more than two neural arcs were simultaneously active. The most important of them can be listed as follows:

S_1 (Size of watch)	\longrightarrow	R_1 (Brain and eye-muscle activity)
S_2 (Shape of watch)	\longrightarrow	R_2 (Brain and eye-muscle activity)



Since all these arcs were active at or about the same time, connections were set up between them all: each of the S's became connected with all the R's. (No attempt is made to show the resulting maze of criss-cross dotted lines on the diagram.) Further, any one of the original S's may now set off all the original R's. Since the word 'Watch' occurred among the S's, it is capable of re-arousing the whole original response. That is to say, the word now recalls the child's total experience with the object: this total experience is the meaning of the word.

Every word is a symbol; it is a short way of representing our experience of an object, a scene, an event, an idea, a person. So long as the word recalls similar experience in other individuals, we can use it for purposes of communication with them. If it does not do so, we cannot use it to convey our thoughts at all.

To put the matter briefly, the meaning of a word to you is the sum-total of your experience with whatever the word represents. Take, for example, the word 'chair'. The meaning of 'chair' to you is the sum-total of your experience with those useful objects. If all the chairs you have known have been high-backed, wooden, unupholstered, and brown in


colour, then the word will bring only those characteristics to your mind. If, however, you have met with chairs of all sizes and descriptions, the word will have a much wider and more complete meaning.

You will see from this that the meaning of a word develops with your expanding experience of what it represents. Take the case of the baby and the watch. His experience is very limited. It includes nothing but the most obvious physical features of the watch—its appearance, its smoothness and weight, its ticking. In a few years' time he will perceive it in far more detail: he will know about its moving hands, about the figures round its dial, about its fragile glass front. The meaning of the word 'Watch' will develop to include these new items of experience. Later still, he will find out that a watch is used to tell the time, and both experience and meaning will grow again. After that, he will learn that some watches are accurate and some not, that they are encased in different metals, that they are of different makes. Again his experience is enriched and the meaning of 'Watch' develops.

This process of enrichment can go on and on. If he grows up to be a railwayman he will demand the best service a watch can give, and will choose one with great understanding. If he grows up to be a watch-maker, a whole field of new experience will be open to him, and the word 'Watch' will include many new items of meaning. In brief, the principle is just this: enrich experience and meaning develops.

MEANING INCLUDES EMOTIONAL TONE

But even this is not the whole story. Because experience always has emotional elements, meaning is emotionally coloured too. The baby enjoyed his encounter with the watch; therefore the word 'Watch' came to have a pleasant



meaning for him. If, however, he had been struck with it, or it had been snatched angrily out of his hand, he would have come to feel very differently toward it.

How, for example, do you respond to the word 'mathematics'? Does it tend to arouse a nice, warm glow, or does it bring you a slight sense of depression? Consult your experience for the reason.

There are words that drop out of use because their emotional tone becomes intolerable. Many such words are concerned with death, and 'graveyard' may be taken as a good illustration of them. Every so many years we have to find a new name for places of burial: from 'graveyard' we go to 'cemetery', and from 'cemetery' to 'garden of remembrance'. Often we have several words with the same meaning but with different emotional tones, so that we may use whichever one is best suited to our mood. Here is a short list to which you can easily add:

A man you like is very close with his money. You use the word 'thrifty'. With someone you dislike, you are apt to use the word 'mean'. The action you call 'cautious' on one occasion, you may call 'timid' on another. The players on your team are 'big strapping fellows'; those on the opposing team are 'great hulking louts'. Your friend is 'well-dressed', but your rival is a 'tailor's dummy'. And so on. Words convey feeling as well as thought.

WORDS AS SOURCES OF MISUNDERSTANDING

One of the questions with which this chapter began remains to be answered: Does a word have exactly the same meaning for all the people who use it?

Obviously it has not. No two people have exactly the same experience of anything—therefore, since meaning results from experience, no word means exactly the same to any two people. The emphasis here is on *exactly*. As a matter of practical fact, if we live in similar environments our experiences are nearly the same, and our words have nearly the same meanings.

The lack of exactness brings a great deal of trouble for all that. Consider the case of a man brought up among a group who habitually use plain and forthright words. He later makes the acquaintance of people whose words are carefully chosen and refined. Over and over again—entirely without intention—he shocks these people. They read meanings from their own experience into his words, and judge him accordingly.

Many a misunderstanding, even in a family, is caused in this way. You are thought to mean something you do not at all intend; you use a word in one sense and it is understood in another. Trouble follows. There is, of course, always a possibility you knew perfectly well the two

senses in which your words might be taken!—in that case you deliberately brought the trouble on yourself.

Here is a question for friendly discussion. Is it always an advantage when two neighbouring countries speak the same language? What about the United States and Britain, for example, or Canada and the United States? There are a thousand arguments in favour of a common language, of course. But in the case of two nations with different experiences, could there be any disadvantage in their using the same words?

Two more points in closing. First, the most useful words are those that have a meaning common to all: the simplest words are the best. Where a word is understood by only a few people, it loses much of its value. Technical terms are an exception, since these are words that make for brief and exact communication between experts. Where people use jargon—words that have meaning only for themselves—they do so either to hide something or to impress someone. Where people use pompous and high-sounding expressions that bewilder the listener, they are probably trying to prove their own superiority.

Second, the greatest sin against language is called 'verbalism'. This is to use words parrot-fashion without understanding their meaning. Many people are guilty of it. Even high school students have been known to memorize material in this empty way, and to write it fluently down on an examination paper. They have been known to do so with problems in geometry, with translations from French into English, and with sections of history and geography. Nothing good can be said for this procedure—except perhaps that it is a threadbare and very temporary cloak for ignorance.

CHAPTER 9

HEREDITY

THERE has been, and probably will be for many years to come, an endless argument as to which is the more important—heredity or environment. High-school debating teams have threshed out this question on a great number of occasions, and with varying fortunes. Sometimes the upholders of heredity have been victorious, and sometimes the supporters of environment. Among the general population there are strong beliefs one way and the other. Up to a few years ago there were bitter disputes even among scientists. There need, therefore, be no apology for presenting a chapter on the subject. Certain facts are now pretty thoroughly established, and you owe it to your self-respect to know them.

Let us begin with one fact that goes right to the root of the matter: *only structure is inherited—nothing else*. We inherit our bodies, which include our brains, our endocrine glands and our autonomic systems. We do not inherit our ideas, our preferences and prejudices, our manners and morals, our language, or our muscular habits and skills. Keep this fact steadfastly before you: Nothing but physical structure can be inherited. All else results from the action of environment on the physical structure we bring into the world.

With this basic principle laid firmly down, we can go on to a more detailed investigation. You must remember, however, that a full scientific treatment is quite impossible in this book. Heredity is an enormous subject and many volumes have been written on it, for scientific research in



this field has been going on in thousands of laboratories for a great number of years. All we can do here is examine a few of the most important ideas.

The human individual begins from the union of two cells, the ovum of the mother and the sperm-cell of the father. Each of these cells contains twenty-four tiny bodies known as chromosomes. Thus the original cell of the individual—the fertilized ovum, which results from the union of

ovum and sperm—contains forty-eight chromosomes. This original cell develops by cell-division and specialization into the human being; and every cell in any human being's body (with the exception of reproductive cells—either ova or sperm) contains exactly forty-eight chromosomes.

It should be particularly noted that this chromosome content of forty-eight chromosomes in every bodily cell is the same in every race of people under the sun. There is absolutely no difference in the chromosome content of Whites, Negroes, Yellow Peoples, South Sea Islanders, Eskimos, American Indians, and any other race you can mention. Thus intermarriage, with resulting offspring, can occur between the members of any two races whatsoever. The objections to racial intermarriage are certainly not biological—they have to do with differences in social culture and outlook.

To return: the new individual receives twenty-four

chromosomes from each of his parents. The chromosomes, however, are not simple units, but are composed of tiny elements known as genes. We have not yet learned how many genes make up a human chromosome, but the number is probably large. These genes determine our physical make-up—our height, our weight of bone, our eye-colour, our hair texture, our brain quality, the character of our endocrine glands, the strength of our autonomic system, and so on.

Now carefully note this point. The fact that we have two parents and not one is a great advantage. Each parent contributes half our chromosome content, and, of course, half our gene content. Every gene we receive from one parent is paired with a gene received from the other parent. The two genes in each pair do exactly the same work—if one of them affects the shape of the nose, then the other also affects the shape of the nose. Here is the important thing, however: *one sound gene in a pair is sufficient to do the work of the pair*. For example, if the pair are concerned with developing the shape of the nose, and one of them happens to be defective, a normal nose-shape will nevertheless result. If both are defective, only then will the nose-shape be abnormal.

You will admit this is an excellent arrangement—a kind of insurance policy! All of us inherit many defective genes, but few of us are abnormally developed. So long as we inherit one sound gene in each pair—from one parent or the other—we are perfectly safe.

This raises the question of marriage between first cousins. Obviously enough, first cousins, since they inherit many of the same genes from their common ancestry, are more likely than unrelated people to have their defective genes in the same places. Their offspring, therefore, are more likely than the offspring of unrelated people to have two defective

genes in a pair, and to have some physical abnormality as a result. This is not to say, of course, that the offspring of first cousins must necessarily be blind or deaf or labour under some other bodily handicap; it is only to say that their chances of complete normality are a little worse than the chances of children whose parents are unrelated.

In this connection there is something you must have noticed, namely, that normal parents do not always have normal children, and defective parents do not always have defective children. Let us consider each of these cases in turn.

First, normal parents have many defective genes, but as each of these defective genes is paired with a sound gene, no harm has resulted—each defective gene is covered up. But if both parents have defective genes covered up in this fashion *in the same places*, the defective genes may come together to form a pair in the offspring—with unhappy results.

Second, defective parents have many pairs of defective genes; but if the defective pairs of genes are *in different places*, the offspring, who receive one gene out of each pair from each parent, may have each defective gene covered by a sound one—and so be quite normal.

It need hardly be added that normal parents are greatly to be preferred to defective ones. In spite of the facts just mentioned, the children of normal parents have a very much better chance of being normal than the children of defective parents.

DETERMINATION OF SEX

Let us turn now to the way in which the sex of offspring is determined. Every bodily cell, you will remember, contains forty-eight chromosomes. There is, however, a difference between male and female chromosome content. In

the bodily cell of the male there are forty-six ordinary chromosomes, together with an X chromosome and a Y chromosome. These latter chromosomes—the X and the Y—differ in appearance from the ordinary chromosomes and from each other. In the bodily cell of the female there are forty-six ordinary chromosomes and two X chromosomes.

Reproductive cells contain only twenty-four chromosomes—half the content of the bodily cell. What exactly do they contain? Male reproductive cells (sperm) may contain either twenty-three ordinary chromosomes plus an X chromosome, or twenty-three ordinary chromosomes plus a Y chromosome. Female reproductive cells (ova) must contain twenty-three ordinary chromosomes plus an X chromosome.

The content of sperm and ova can be shown briefly as follows:

Sperm cells: (23 plus X) or (23 plus Y)

Ova: (23 plus X)

Now half the sperm are of the (23 plus X) variety, and half are of the (23 plus Y) variety. A sperm cell of either variety may fertilize the ovum. If the ovum, which is always (23 plus X), is fertilized by a (23 plus X) sperm, the result is a fertilized ovum containing (46 plus 2X), and the sex of the offspring is female. If, however, the ovum (23 plus X), is fertilized by a (23 plus Y) sperm, the result is a fertilized ovum containing (46 plus X plus Y), and the sex of the offspring is male.

According to the law of chance, there should be just as many females born as males. But for some reason not clearly understood this does not occur. Birth records almost invariably show that rather more males than females are born. The balance is restored, however, by the odd fact that more boy babies than girl babies die in infancy.

HEREDITY AND ENVIRONMENT

We now come to the question with which this chapter began: Whether heredity or environment is more important in the production of a human being? Or, in the language of the garden, it might be asked: Which is more important in producing a plant, the seed or the soil? One thing is evident at once: both are essential. Without the seed, the soil could contribute nothing; without the soil, the seed would die. Heredity supplies the physical structure, in which all the potentialities for development already exist; environment decides the extent to which these potentialities shall be developed.



Let us take a case. A child is born of a certain stock and with a certain physical structure. Everything he can become is settled in advance—but not everything he will become. He has a digestive system capable of digesting food, and thereby of enabling him to reach the height and weight to which his gene pattern entitles him. But the food must come from his environment. If his food is scanty or of poor quality, he will fall below his potentialities. He has a vocal apparatus capable of forming the words of any language, but his environment will decide what language he will speak

and how well he will speak it. He has a pair of eyes capable of excellent sight, but they may be strengthened or strained according to lighting conditions and the work he has to do.

All of this is obviously true, and we may go on to make a more exact analysis. Man's nature can be said to have three sides: the physical, the mental, and the social. How do heredity and environment operate in each of these?

On the physical side, heredity is by far the more important factor. Unless conditions in the environment are very extreme—which they usually are not—they have no great effect on the development of physical structure. Extreme conditions, such as long starvation, accidents, and disease, will, of course, damage structure and upset the normal course of development; but less severe conditions have small influence upon the body. We can stand a great deal, and still develop normally.

On the mental side, heredity again is the main factor. The brain is part of our structure, and its problem-solving power seems to depend on its original quality. Intelligence is only slightly affected by surroundings. When children are taken from squalid homes and placed in high-grade foster homes, they increase very little in intelligence. More's the pity! This must not be taken to mean that environment is helpless to improve the mind. Far from it. But intelligence and the mind are very different things, as you will see quite clearly later on. Intelligence is the sheer ability to solve problems; the mind is composed of the ideas gained from experience. Heredity decides intelligence; environment decides the content of the mind.

On the social side, environment is the more important factor. Our ideas and attitudes, our manners and morals, our language, our skills, and our general culture—all these come to us from the social group with whom we live. Yet even here heredity plays its part. The child with a high

intelligence will acquire far more from his environment than can be acquired by the child with a low intelligence. The child with hair-trigger emotions will react to his environment in a way quite different from that of the easy-going child. You have seen this sort of thing yourself. Two children in one family have much the same environment, but one learns more than the other because he has a better brain; and the other may, perhaps, be more excitable because he has a vigorous thyroid gland and highly responsive autonomic system. Yet when this has been said, the fact remains that the culture of any individual—his social behaviour—is chiefly the outcome of his environment.

Let us close the discussion with a couple of illustrations to make the whole matter plain.

Mary and Marion are two sisters who happen to be identical twins. They started out, that is to say, from one fertilized ovum, which for some unknown reason split at the first cell-division into two individuals. Very shortly after they were born, they lost both parents and were offered for adoption. Mary was adopted by an English-speaking, Protestant couple living in Vancouver; Marion was adopted by a French-speaking, Catholic couple living in Montreal. They have now arrived, in excellent health, at the age of twenty. How do they compare?

At birth they were alike as two peas—no one could tell them apart. They are still so much alike physically, that if they exchanged dresses, either one could pass without question for the other. Environment has had no noticeable effect on their bodies.

What about their intelligence? It was undoubtedly the same when they were born. If they were given a test fair to them both today, their I.Qs would be practically identical. Here again, heredity is the great factor—environment has done little or nothing.

But on the social side they will be extremely different. They will have different habits, different ideas, different beliefs, different speech, and different outlooks. Clearly then, heredity has had almost no influence upon their culture—environment has been responsible for it all.

The above case is one in which heredity is the same, and environment is different. The second is one in which this situation is reversed.

Tom and Joe are two brothers, born a year apart, who have lived all their seventeen and sixteen years in a well-to-do home with their parents. There are no other children in the family. The parents have provided them with everything needful to their health and happiness, and have treated them as nearly alike as is humanly possible.

But the boys are very different. Tom, the elder, is a vigorous, athletic fellow, who has a hard struggle in school, and who is noted for his violent temper. His parents find him very hard to handle, and he has threatened on more than one occasion to run away from home.

Joe, on the other hand, is the studious and placid type. He gets along with everybody, does his school-work easily, and minds his own business. He has scarcely ever given his parents a moment's worry.

Why are these boys so different? They have shared the same environment from infancy. The answer is to be found in their physical structure. Joe has far better brains than Tom, his endocrine glands supply his blood-stream with far less powerful secretions, and the sympathetic division of his autonomic system is far less easily aroused. Born of the same parents, these boys have nevertheless received different shares of the ancestral stock. Their structures are so unlike that even a common environment is powerless to produce anything but a general similarity in culture.

IMPROVING THE STOCK

One question more, and this chapter on heredity may be closed: Is there any way of improving human stock? So much depends on the structure we bring into the world, it would be a glorious thing if we could somehow manage to make sure it is invariably sound.

Eugenics is an answer of a sort, and it is put forward by people who call themselves Eugenists. Here are the two methods suggested:

First, Positive Eugenics: which holds that sound stocks should be *selected* for marriage.

Second, Negative Eugenics: which holds that defective stocks should be *prevented* from marriage.

Now these two methods, if they were ruthlessly put into practice for a long enough time, would undoubtedly bring about a marked improvement in human structure. They have, of course, been used in the cases of cattle and horses, with excellent results.

The difficulty with Positive Eugenics is easy to see. Human beings are neither cattle nor horses. In the matter of marriage they simply refuse to be coerced. Only a brutally totalitarian state could exercise enough force to compel them; the whole spirit of democracy revolts against the idea.

With Negative Eugenics the case is very different, and here there is much to be said for the claims of the Eugenists. We will all agree without further ado that the feeble-minded, the sufferers from hereditary mental disease, and those whose bodies are dreadfully defective from birth, should never become parents. This far, democratic society might venture to go. It is when we come to particular cases not quite in the foregoing classification that we begin to differ. What, for example, is to be done about a man born with a club-foot or a cleft palate, or a humped back?

How serious must a physical defect be before a person is debarred from marriage? Should all dwarfs be debarred?—and if not, which types of dwarfism should be regarded as exceptions? You can see for yourself the endless debates that would arise. Just to perplex you completely, here is one more question to answer. What should be done about a person born, let us say, without arms, who turns out to have an I.Q. of 175?

Now to sum up. Positive Eugenics is not a practical method. All that can be said for it is this: if the word 'encouraged' were to be used in place of the word 'selected', the idea would be more in keeping with our democratic society.

Negative Eugenics, as it concerns feeble-minded people, and people suffering from hereditary mental disease, is both practical and desirable. As it concerns people with inherited physical defects, it should be approached with great caution.

One point more. To believe that Negative Eugenics will wipe out feeble-mindedness in a few generations is to believe nonsense. Only eleven per cent of the feeble-minded people alive today are the offspring of feeble-minded parents.

CHAPTER 10

PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT


THE most visible fact about human beings is that they grow up. From a weight of a very few pounds at birth, they increase to a poundage twenty or thirty times as great; and from a height measured in inches, they lengthen to a height measured in feet. Physical development includes the whole body—bones, muscles, internal organs, and brain. As we develop, we become stronger, faster, and better co-ordinated. Up to the sixteenth year, our intelligence advances in strict accordance with our age.

All this you know very well already, but there are some details that will be of interest to you. These, it is the purpose of the present chapter to present.

First, and in general, there is a remarkable change in bodily proportions from infancy to maturity. If a baby merely grew bigger, he would turn into a strange-looking man—a man with a very large head, sloping shoulders, and short legs. This change of proportions occurs in many animals besides man, as you will recall at once if you think of a colt's little body perched upon stilt-like legs beside the symmetrical form of its mother.

MUSCLES

Baby muscles are far lighter and more watery than those of an adult. At the age of eight, muscles are about 27 per cent of the bodily weight; at sixteen, they are about 44 per cent. It is clear from these figures that sustained manual work is a severe strain on children, and may do



At birth, about four heads high; at 5 years, about 6 heads high; adult, about $7\frac{1}{2}$ heads high.

them lasting damage. Games requiring long and hard muscular effort are best fitted to the middle and later teens.

BONES

Bones are soft and rather gelatinous in childhood, and harden gradually as age increases. Girls outdo boys in this respect, for their bones harden rather faster: indeed, they are a year ahead at the age of six, and two years ahead at the age of twelve. This is just another instance of the fact that girls mature more rapidly than boys—you will remember they learn to speak before boys do.

Bones lengthen greatly in the early teens, producing marked changes in height. The femur may grow two inches in one year.

Muscles and bones do not grow at the same rate, and this causes many mishaps and much embarrassment. You know the so-called 'awkward stage', when the poor victim seems to be all arms and legs, and has no accurate control of movement. Most of us go through it. It is due to muscles growing too fast for bones, and so ruining co-ordination. You have heard too of 'growing pains'. These are caused by bones growing too fast for muscles and so setting up muscular strains. Fortunately, it all comes out well in the end—mature muscles and bones are excellently accommodated to one another.

CIRCULATION

Great changes occur in circulation as age increases. The pulse rate of an infant is 120 per minute; that of an adult is 72 per minute. Blood circulates in an infant in 12 seconds; in an adult it takes twice as long.

Perhaps nothing tells the story better than the ratio of the heart to the arteries. At birth, it is 25 to 20; at thirteen years of age, it is 140 to 50; and at eighteen, it is 290 to 61. You will see that the heart gradually gains a tremendous advantage, thus adding very greatly indeed to the power and endurance of the individual. In simpler, and of course, more approximate figures, the ratios can be stated thus: At birth, 5 to 4; at thirteen, 5 to 1.8; and at eighteen, 5 to 1.1.

The ratio changes rapidly in the early teens, and may cause such alarming symptoms as palpitation of the heart, skipping a heart-beat, and irregularity of pulse. These, however, should not be taken seriously.

RESPIRATION

Just one note under this heading. Lung capacity steadily increases, and thus completes the pattern of development. Heavy bones can only be moved by strong muscles; strong

muscles need plenty of nourishment from the blood; the blood depends for its efficiency on oxygen supplied by the lungs.

THE BRAIN AND NERVOUS SYSTEM

The brain increases to two or three times its original size during the first year, and is almost adult size by the sixth year. The full weight is reached in the early teens.

No new cells are added after birth. They are present at birth in an undeveloped or granule form; and as life goes on, more and more of them ripen into activity. During the early teens, the number of developed cells is about doubled, and by the age of sixteen the process of development is complete. Naturally, the greater the number of working cells, the greater the number of connections that can be set up between them and the other parts of the body.

Now it is necessary at this point to recall what you have learned about neural arcs—which, of course, are lines of nerve connection.

At birth, these arcs are comparatively few, and have to do with reflexes, emotions, and the bodily processes that keep us alive (breathing, digestion, and the like). A baby is rather unorganized as regards his nervous system. He responds to a strong stimulation with activity of his whole body.

This response of the whole body to a strong stimulus is called 'mass reaction'. To illustrate: when a baby suffers pain, he kicks his legs, flings his arms about, arches his body, moves his head from side to side, and cries out with all his might. He gives every response of which he is capable.

Mass reaction becomes rarer and rarer as we grow up. It is seen in a child who goes into a tantrum, and occasionally in an adult who loses his control in a desperate situation.

The development of new neural arcs through condition-

ing gives us our far more suitable and more limited responses. Instead of responding with our whole bodies, we make only those muscular movements that meet the situation. If an adult turns his ankle while stepping off the curb, he does not fling himself down on the pavement, and thresh about to the accompaniment of loud screams. He simply takes his weight from the injured ankle and regains his balance. He has learned what movements are needed in such a situation—or to put it differently, he has established certain neural arcs, by conditioning, that give him a limited and effective response.

We start with mass reaction, and for various purposes we gradually select out of it the movements we actually require. All our skills are carved out of mass reaction by the connecting up of neural arcs into definite patterns.

This idea is rather difficult to understand at once, but it is immensely important and worth a strong effort. Let us come at it by way of two cases.

A girl is learning to shoot with a basket-ball. At first she is dreadfully clumsy and unsuccessful. Why? Because she is making far too many movements—most of which are useless to her purpose, and some of which are positively detrimental. The coach comes along and shows her what to do: how to balance her weight, how to hold the ball, how to throw it. He gives her a much simpler action-pattern than the one she was using. Soon there is a great change in her efficiency and success. She eliminates all the useless and detrimental movements, establishes the necessary ones by practice, and becomes both graceful and expert. She has made a pattern of neural arcs to operate for her in basket-ball shooting.

You must have heard of economy of motion in industry. The poor workman is the man who makes a great number of needless movements in doing a certain job. The good

workman makes the fewest possible movements, and surpasses him in every way. Industrial investigators—efficiency experts—have given a great deal of attention to this matter, and have changed many poor workmen into astonishingly good ones.

To repeat: the way to become skilful in any game or physical activity is to eliminate useless movements. In becoming expert, we form limited and definite patterns of neural arcs to control our responses. As we grow older, these patterns increase in number and refinement, and so enable us to adjust ourselves adequately to the various situations we meet in life.

OTHER ORGANS

There is no point in discussing all the organs of the body, one by one. The same principle of development applies throughout. The stomach, for example, changes in size and shape; and the digestive system can cope with different foods at different stages of life. Every organ has its own course of development. In the normal person, all the organs develop in reasonable harmony.

PUBERTY AND AFTERWARDS

In the early teens—usually between the ages of twelve and fourteen in girls, and between the ages of thirteen and fifteen in boys—there occur bodily changes that mark the end of childhood and the beginning of adult life. The period during which these changes occur is called puberty. The girl becomes a young woman and the boy a young man.

You are well acquainted with these changes, so there is no need to detail them here. Just one will be taken as an example, namely, the voice.

At puberty, a girl's voice becomes fuller and richer, but its

general pitch remains the same. Her ability to sing is improved. In the case of a boy, the voice begins to deepen, and continues to do so till it has fallen a whole octave. He loses some of his vocal control, and is often embarrassed by producing queer and wholly unintentional sounds. Usually he has to give up singing—with the unfortunate result that after a couple of years of silence he has lost his desire to sing. It is worth noting that some modern authorities claim a boy can sing right through this period of change, if he is provided with music of suitable range.

Perhaps the most striking change after puberty is in social behaviour. Boys and girls, who up to this point have shown very little interest in one another, and who in fact have definitely preferred the companionship of their own sex, now find pleasure in mixed company. They take their first awkward steps in what may be called normal adult life.

Naturally enough, in such a new situation and under the impulse of new emotion, they are apt to blunder and to meet with a good deal of embarrassment before they acquire confidence and social ease. They have to learn by a certain amount of trial and error how to behave. They go through the stage of showing off, of violent 'crushes' and of equally violent dislikes, and at last become socially competent and well poised. Here as in every aspect of life, there must be a period of awkwardness and uncertainty before adequate patterns of behaviour are established.

CHAPTER 11

MENTAL DEVELOPMENT

INTELLIGENCE is problem-solving power. It depends on the quality of the brain, and varies greatly from one person to another. It reaches its peak at about the age of sixteen. Little or nothing can be done to improve it.

The mind, on the other hand, consists of ideas, and is built up through experience during the whole course of life. It is limited, of course, by intelligence, but within that limitation it is capable of endless development by the environment.

Consider for illustration two men of normal intelligence, one savage and the other civilized. Their problem-solving power is equal—which is to say, their possibilities of mental development are the same. But their minds are utterly different. The savage possesses only the ideas current in his environment, ideas connected with warfare, with hunting, with queer taboos and queerer superstitions. He perhaps believes if he eats the heart of a courageous enemy he will increase in courage, or if he sprinkles water with proper ceremonies he will compel the fall of rain. He is unacquainted with the simplest principles of science; he has no writing, no history, no literature; his art and music are primitive and rude; and he is probably unable to count beyond ten.

How different is the case of the man who has been surrounded from his birth with all the resources and ideas of civilization. Science and the arts have furnished his mind. Useful and thoroughly verified ideas are everywhere about



him in his society. They are as much part of his atmosphere as the air he breathes.

What is the difference between these two men? It is a difference in mental content. The ideas of the savage are few, inaccurate, and vague; those of the civilized man are numerous, true, and definite. Environment forms the mind. If these two people had been exchanged at birth, their mental positions would now be reversed. You yourself, if you sincerely desire to do so, can, by acquiring sound ideas, develop your mind in such fashion as will amaze not only yourself but everyone who knows you.


RELIABLE SEQUENCES AND RATIONALITY

Let us look into the matter a little more closely. All science—all verified and verifiable knowledge—is based on the simple principle that events follow one another in an orderly and reliable way. You throw a ball into the air, and

in a little while it falls to the ground. Always in your experience and in the experience of everyone else, this has happened. So you are justified in *expecting* it to happen. A, the throwing of the ball, is followed by B, the falling of the ball. The sequence, A followed by B, is a sound idea that is part of the content of your mind. The person who does not expect A to be followed by B is not a rational person.

The whole world, both physical and social, is filled with such sequences as this. Consider a few of them. A (Putting a match to a well-laid fire), is followed by B (The fire blazes up), and this in turn is followed by C (Warmth is produced). Being a rational person, you expect this sequence and act accordingly.

Other sequences can be shown more briefly by putting them in diagrammatic form:



These of course are very simple and familiar sequences, but they illustrate the principle for all that. They are so much a part of your mind that you always expect A to be followed by B, and so on. You expect this because it has never in your experience failed to occur. If you were to meet someone who expected fatigue to be followed by eager activity, or bruises to be followed by enjoyment, you would regard him as a fool.

Who then is a rational being? Simply a person who ex-

pects B to follow A, and C to follow B, in all the ordinary affairs of life; simply a person who has observed events with sufficient accuracy to know how a reasonable number of sequences work out. And the irrational man is one who has so filled his mind with false sequences that he expects A to be followed by M, and X by R; one who expects all robbers to be like Robin Hood, and all broken mirrors to bring bad luck.

You need scarcely be told that many sequences are not simple enough to be set down as A B C. Often they are very intricate and hard to grasp, as you must have noticed in your study of physics, chemistry or biology.

Take, for example, the sequence of sound and hearing. In its simple form this might be: A (The thud of a falling tree)——→ B (Sound waves in the air)——→ C (Vibration in the ear)——→ D (Neural impulse in auditory nerve)——→ E (Awareness and interpretation in the brain). In the case of an ignorant person, even this might be simplified to: A (The thud of a falling tree)——→ B (Awareness and interpretation of the hearer).


But the sequence would be much more elaborate in the case of an informed person, and might be as follows: A (Thud of a falling tree)——→ B (Vibrations at the scene of the crash)——→ C (Sound waves in the air)——→ D (Vibration of ear-drums)——→ E (Vibration of ossicles)——→ F (Vibration within cochleas)——→ G (Stimulation of certain areas of basilar membranes)——→ H (Specific neural impulses in auditory nerves)——→ I (Brain awareness of direction, loudness, pitch, and quality of the sound)——→ J (Brain interpretation, namely, that a tree of a certain size has fallen in a certain place).

From this analysis, you can readily see that the same sequence can be understood very simply or very elaborately, according to the experience of the person who perceives

it. The more educated you are, the more detailed are the sequences with which your mind is furnished. But note this point particularly: the sequence A (The thud of a falling tree)——→ B (Awareness and interpretation of the hearer) is just as true as the sequence that went from A to J. So far as it goes, it gives its possessor a rational view of the world. Within its limitations, it is a rational and useful idea.

FALSE SEQUENCES AND IRRATIONALITY

It is a most unfortunate thing that many of the sequences that make up our minds are false. We acquire these false sequences in a score of ways—from other people, from books, from moving pictures, from our own inaccurate observation, from our own desires. They are sequences that simply do not occur in the real world; they cause us to expect things that do not happen; and they lead us into all kinds of foolish



behaviour. In order to be rational, we must do everything in our power to get rid of them—and furthermore, we must unceasingly guard ourselves against acquiring others of the same sort.

Consider a few of the most common. It is to be hoped they strike you as ridiculous!

- A (Leaves in a tea-cup) → B (Examination by an expert) → C (Knowledge of the future)
- A (A big jaw) → B (Determination)
- A (A bulging forehead) → B (Magnificent brain) → C (Great ability)
- A (Fine student) → B (Poor athlete)
- A (An aggressive manner) → B (Plenty of self-confidence)
- A (Fish food) → B (Improvement of brains)
- A (Poor eyesight) → B (Greater acuteness of hearing)
- A (Black eye) → B (Application of beef-steak) → C (Cure)
- A (Fatigue) → B (Physical exercise) → C (More effective study)
- A (Rabbit-foot) → B (Stroking in emergency) → C (Happy outcome)
- A (Untried theory) → B (Brave new world)
- A (Desired goal) → B (Determined effort) → C (Sure success)
- A (Member of another race) → B (Definitely inferior)

Perhaps the foregoing list is long enough. You will be able to add to it with no trouble at all. Indeed, if an at-

tempt were made to set down all the false sequences that distort the minds of supposedly cultured and educated people, there would be need for twenty books the size of this one. Even the most rational minds are not without some irrational ideas.

You will observe that high intelligence is no safeguard against the acquiring of false sequences, and that low intelligence is no guarantee that they have been acquired. In general, of course, bright people are more critical of ideas than dull ones are—but there are many exceptions.

Take the case, for example, of Peter Jones, Ph.D., a professor of mathematics in a first-rate university. There can be no doubt of his brilliant intelligence, because he has written several masterly books in his chosen field and is regarded as a leading mathematician. But in spite of his brains, Dr. Jones firmly believes the following absurdities: all politicians, with the exception of those in his own party, are thieves and rascals; all medical doctors are ignorant quacks; all professors are abominably underpaid; mathematics is the most important subject in the world; he himself is an absolutely indispensable man; all women, including his wife and seventeen-year-old daughter, are very childish and wholly unable to reason.

Here are some of the consequences of these absurd ideas in the life of Dr. Jones. He is very superior, dogmatic, and hard to live with. He will take no advice, and is never done making social blunders that antagonize his friends. He has a bad heart condition, but steadily refuses to consult a physician. He is by no means a happy man, and the probability is he will die before his time.

Now how did he come to be like that? How did he manage to acquire these false and harmful sequences? Well, he once came into close contact with a politician who turned out to be a rascal—and condemned all politicians on the

strength of that one case. He had a rather similar experience with a medical man. Then his parents, who were very proud of his ability, had idolized and praised him to such an extent that he became ridiculously vain. This overweening vanity of his made him contemptuous of everyone who was not a first-class mathematician.

The case of Dr. Jones is no exaggeration. There are plenty of clever people all around you in the world who are no better off. Their false sequences may be different from his, but the likelihood is they lead to just as bad results.

Let us turn now to Silas Green, an old farmer whose I.Q. is about 80. There is no smartness in him, no clever talk, and no sparkle. But his farm is in fine shape, and he is quite well-to-do. Not only this, he is respected by his neighbours and regarded as one of the steady men in his little community.

How can this be? The answer is that although the sequences making up Silas Green's mind are few and simple, they are true and useful. They have to do with the practical concerns of his life—such as sowing, cultivating, and reaping—and because they are reliable, they carry him comfortably along. Furthermore, he has no particular conceit of himself, and is willing to take his wife's advice in matters he does not understand. Thus, within the limits of his capacity, he is a sensible and practical old man, who lives in harmony with his friends and at peace with himself. The point is just this: he knows little, *but everything he knows is true*. He is in a much better situation than the man who knows a great deal—of which some fifty per cent is false.

From these cases, and from many others within the range of your own observation, you will see that rationality can exist at almost any intellectual level. There is, of course, a great advantage in being highly intelligent. The highly

intelligent man can acquire more numerous, more detailed, and more accurate sequences; the man of humble intelligence must content himself with acquiring sequences that are fewer and simpler. But in each case, rationality depends on the sequences being true.

THINKING

The word 'thinking' is dreadfully abused! It is taken to describe nearly everything that goes on in the mind. We may be day-dreaming, or letting our minds wander aimlessly about, or listening vaguely to a speaker—but if anyone asks us, we are always 'thinking'! Whereas the truth of the matter is that thinking is one of the rarest things we do.

Consider this case. You are wandering down a street in the business section, with plenty of time to keep an appointment. Various things in the store windows attract your wavering attention. You say to yourself, "That's rather nice—I wouldn't mind if I had it," or "My goodness, what rubbishy stuff people try to sell nowadays." You see someone half a block away, and say, "Why, there's Gerry Martin," and a moment later, "No, it's not Gerry after all—just someone in the same style of overcoat." A car blasts its horn behind your shoulder and you give a violent start. "What's this town coming to!" you mutter angrily, "I'd like to give that mannerless driver a bit of my mind." A brilliant neon sign attracts your eye, and you smile again. "There's nothing like lively lighting to make the town seem gay." Then you catch a glimpse of your moving figure in a store window and adjust the angle of your hat. "Not too bad!" you tell yourself complacently, "Not too bad at all!"

Is this thinking? Certainly not. It is just the mind going off at tangents under the influence of stray stimuli. If you were really thinking, you would probably be unaware of them—you would be trusting your automatic habits to get

you to your destination, and your mind would be a thousand miles away.

What then is thinking? It is the effort of the mind to solve a problem. Nothing else. Whether you find a solution or not, if you bring your mind steadily to bear on a problem, you are thinking.

Now, you will realize this does not happen very often. The more efficient your habits, the less frequently you will find yourself at a loss; the more experienced you are, the more rarely will life present you with problems to solve. In fact, you may go through a whole day without thinking at all. Even such things as speaking and reading can be carried on at the habit level and with a minimum of active thought. You could read this whole book mechanically through and not think once. Many a teacher, who has taught much the same material in much the same situation for a dozen years, can teach an entire period without having to think at all.

The steps in thinking. If thinking is the effort of the mind to solve a problem, our next question must naturally be: How is this done? We must examine the way the mind works in problem-solving, so that the method will be clearly understood, and ready for use. It will be worth your while to do some thinking now, in order to grasp the method. Once thoroughly grasped, it is certain to be of excellent service to you in solving any and every problem you meet.

The method of thinking falls into five steps, which may be analysed as follows:

1. Awareness of a problem, with desire to solve it.
2. Close examination of problem, and gathering together (from memory, books, and inquiries) every bit of information that can be related to it.
3. Suggesting a solution (Hypothesis).
4. Testing the suggested solution, by trying it out, or

by placing it against one's background of verified knowledge.

5. Rejection or acceptance of the suggested solution, or suspension of judgment until more information is obtained.

Before we enter into a discussion of the method, there is one important thing to be noted. It works in the solution of all problems, whether they are simple or complex; and it works in every branch of human life.

A couple of illustrations will provide material for the discussion that is to follow. The first has to do with solving a simple problem, and the second with solving a complex one. The method in both cases is exactly the same.

First, a boy has saved up three dollars to buy his father a birthday present. He is sitting in his room trying to decide how to spend the money to best advantage. What about a pipe? Well, his father has half a dozen pipes already, and a new pipe never seems to be very popular. What about a book? No, his father never has time to read books; he just reads the newspaper and an occasional magazine. Will a pair of slippers be the thing? Too expensive altogether—three dollars won't do much in that direction. Then how about ties? The very thing! He decides to get his father two brightly-coloured ties—the kind he will be happy to wear himself when the occasion arises.

The case is easily analysed. The boy has a problem and is eager to solve it. He looks it carefully over, considering the amount he has saved, his father's tastes, and the goods available. The first three suggested solutions (pipe, book, and slippers) are in turn rejected because they fail to meet the needs of the situation. The fourth suggested solution is accepted. The problem is solved, and thinking is over.

Here is the second and more complex illustration. George Adamson has bought a farm, along the edge of which runs

the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He has a close view of the track from the veranda of his house, and because he lives alone he takes great interest in passing trains. He notices after a while that an engine sometimes carries two flags, one on each side and right up at the front. He notices further that the flags are always of the same colour, either both green or both white. No other colours are used, and often, of course, there are no flags at all.

The question of the flags interests George immensely, and puzzles him more from day to day. Why do they appear on some trains and not on others? Why are they sometimes green and sometimes white? There is no one to ask, so he mulls the problem over in his own head.

Various possibilities suggest themselves. Perhaps certain engineers put flags up for personal reasons. An Irishman would certainly choose green. But what about white? George knows only two things about white: it is a symbol of purity; and the Chinese use it for mourning. Neither of these two seems to fit the situation. Furthermore, there is grave doubt as to whether the railway company would allow its engineers to carry personal flags. He shakes his head and gives up the idea.

Perhaps the flags have a purpose like that of green and red lights. Green again fits in very well—but what about white? And what about engines without any flags? George makes no progress in this direction, and turns a little reluctantly to something else.

Perhaps the flags are there for sheer decoration. Perhaps the railway company is just trying to make its engines look beautiful. George knows very well this is a miserable solution, but he is so completely at a loss he would like to accept it. In fact, he forces himself to accept it for two or three days, and makes an effort to forget the whole matter.

But do what he will, the flags continue to haunt him. In

desperation, he decides to go into the question in a thoroughly methodical way. So for days he watches every east-bound train that passes his farm, notes down the exact time, and keeps a faithful record of green and white flags. After a while, he knows the regular train schedule very well indeed—three passenger trains a day, one passing at 9:15 a.m., one at 2:31 p.m., and one at 6:43 p.m. These three trains are almost always exactly on time, and he notices that though they sometimes carry green flags, they never carry white ones.

George decides to concentrate for a week or two on white flags. If he can find the secret of the white ones, he feels he will simplify his problem. He watches carefully, and jots down the following facts: trains carrying white flags are never on the regular schedule; such trains are comparatively few in number. The idea of specials leaps into his mind. "That's what they are!" he tells himself exultantly. "They must be special trains and nothing else."

Now he comes back with greatly increased confidence to the green flags. What facts can he jot down about them? Day after day he watches carefully, and records these definite things. Regular trains may carry green flags, or they may not. The number of passenger trains passing his farm—apart from specials—is not always the same. Every time green flags occur, more than three trains pass his farm.

Suddenly something flashes through his mind. He has heard of trains running in several sections due to heavy traffic. Maybe green flags indicate that a second section of the same train is coming along. If so, they would be a necessary warning to men working on the track. The idea delights him—he feels he is on the way to a solution. All he has to do now is relate green flags to the number of trains.

For days his solution works. One green-flagged regular

train is always a sign that four trains will pass that day; two green-flagged regular trains is a sure indication that five will pass. George is on the verge of being completely satisfied, when an unexpected thing happens. One day, an off-schedule train goes by with green flags!

For a little while, George is completely at sea. Then he gathers his wits and sits determinedly down to review the facts. What can an off-schedule train with green flags mean? Well, he expected an extra train to pass, because the regular 9:15 carried green flags. So far, so good. The off-schedule train might be a second section of the 9:15. But why should a second section carry flags?

He puzzles over the question so much, it drives everything else out of his head. It is nearly two o'clock when he sits down to lunch. Just as he is pouring his coffee, he hears a rumble and rushes out to the veranda. There goes a passenger train at 2:02—a train that carries no flags. What can have happened? Is it possible the regular 2:31 is twenty-nine minutes early? The flagless train passing his farm is certainly no special.

He eats his lunch in a hurry, and goes down to the edge of the track to wait until 2:31. Right to the minute, the regular train comes along—and George breathes a great sigh of relief. His reasoning has been correct—the exception has definitely proved the rule! That flagless, off-schedule train just had to be the third section of the 9:15. Triumphantly, George whips out his note-book and writes down his conclusions:

1. A special train carries white flags.
2. A regular train carries green flags if it is to be followed by a second section.
3. A second section train carries green flags if it is to be followed by a third section.

George's tensions and labours are over. Filled with an

intoxicating sense of success, he scrawls "Q.E.D." at the end of the page—and goes happily back to the less exhausting tasks of agriculture. But from this day forward, he will certainly check up on every train that goes past. He will look out for flags and make his well-established deductions. He will be a satisfied and comfortable man until the railway company makes a change in its signals.

This case, complex though it is, can be analysed into its five steps just as the first one was. George was aware of a problem, and his interest in it was so great it seized hold of his mind. It put him into a state of strong tension, which made peace impossible until he had solved it.

He proceeded therefore to an examination of the facts. At first he did this rather superficially and with hope of a quick solution.

His first hypotheses (engineer's personal flags, stop-and-go signals, and decorations) were products of this superficial and hopeful examination, and of his ignorance of railroad ways.

He tested these hypotheses out one after the other, and tried to see each in turn as a satisfactory explanation of the facts.

Since they failed to explain the facts in a way that satisfied his mind, he was forced to reject them. True, he clung to the last for a short time, but that was because he seemed to be at the end of his resources.

Note now that in reaching a true solution he repeated the same process. The only difference was in his treatment of the second step: examination of the facts. This time he took infinite pains: he observed closely and recorded his observations methodically. This time his hypotheses regarding white flags and green flags arose out of detailed and accurate scrutiny of the situation, and as a result they were much more likely to be correct. In fact, they proved to be

correct. They were so good they withstood every test he applied to them, and he was able to accept them with an easy mind.

THREE FACTORS IN SUCCESSFUL THINKING

There are three things about thinking that remain to be mentioned before we close the discussion—three things that make it possible to produce a sound solution to a problem. These are intelligence, experience in the field of the problem, and stubborn persistence. Without any one of them, the thinker is likely to fail.

Intelligence has been defined as the ability to solve the problems of life, and you need scarcely be reminded it is found among people in varying degrees. Some people are so brilliant, they can successfully solve problems of the greatest complexity; others are so stupid they can hardly make change for a dollar.

The second essential is experience in the field of the problem. Consider this case. Mr. Percival Abbott, who is a writer of great distinction and an able commentator on world affairs, is travelling along the highway when his automobile suddenly stalls. He throws the car out of gear and goes to work with the starter. He tries the starter over and over again, till his wife warns him he will run down his battery. Then he gets out of the car, opens the hood, and peers uncertainly at the engine. He reaches in with his hand and fiddles with this and that—but all he manages to do is smear his sleeve with grease. In a little while he gets back in his seat and gives the starter another spin. All to no purpose. He has to wait helplessly till someone comes along to solve his problem. Eventually the driver of a battered truck comes to his assistance, and puts everything right in about ten seconds by reconnecting a wire.

Mr. Abbott, brilliantly intelligent though he is, cannot solve the simple problem of a stalled car. Why so? Because he knows nothing about gasoline engines. Because he has had no mechanical training. Because he is without experience in the field of the problem.

The third essential is stubborn persistence. This, you will see at once, depends largely on interest. Where interest is strong, persistence almost inevitably results. Where interest is weak, one of two things follows: either the problem is cast aside at the first obstacle, or a poor solution is thankfully accepted.

The place where persistence is chiefly shown is in the jump back from step five to step two—from rejection of an erroneous hypothesis to thorough-going re-examination of the data. Many people give up at this point. They are especially likely to do so when re-examination of data means getting more information—when it calls for exact observation, visiting the research department of a library, or consulting an expert. It is worth noting that no really great problem has ever been solved without unwearied persistence; the story of any outstanding scientist or discoverer—Galileo, Columbus, Pasteur, Curie, whom you will—bears striking witness to this fact.

JUDGMENT

Judgment is simply the fourth and fifth steps of thinking taken together, and separated from the others. It is the process of testing an idea presented to the mind and of rejecting or accepting that idea. Here are the questions we must try to answer: How is the testing done? Why do we reject some ideas and accept others?

You will remember that the mind is built up out of the sequences we have acquired in the course of our lives. You will remember too that these sequences are not equally

numerous, detailed, and accurate in all people, that many of the sequences you yourself possess are unreliable.

Now, when a new sequence (idea) comes to your attention, you place it against the sequences already in your mind. If it is in harmony with these you accept it, and if it is disharmonious you reject it. Testing is just the process of comparing and contrasting the new sequence with the sequences you already possess. Your judgment, therefore, is no better than the present content of your mind.

It follows that people whose minds are built up out of true sequences—sequences, that is to say, whose counterparts actually exist in the world—will have sound judgment; and that those whose minds contain false sequences will often have faulty judgment.

Let us clear the point up with an illustration. Here are two men, Smith and Robinson, who are sales-managers. Smith has acquired the sequence, A (Aggressive and confident manner)——→ B (Best type of salesman). Robinson, on the other hand, has acquired the sequence, A (Aggressive and confident manner)——→ B (Not necessarily the best type of salesman). A quiet and very polite young fellow, with real ability in salesmanship, applies to Smith for a position. Smith promptly declines to employ him. He goes to Robinson, and after a searching but courteous interview he is accepted. In five years he becomes the best salesman on Robinson's staff. Now note Smith's error in judgment results from the fact that the applicant's personality is not in harmony with his (Smith's) unreliable sequence regarding the best type of salesman. Robinson's good judgment is based on the true sequence he is fortunate enough to possess.

Even with an excellently furnished mind, however, sound judgments cannot always be made. It is often the case that a person does not possess enough ideas *in a certain line* to

arrive at a decision. He must then, if he is wise, do everything in his power to obtain the information he lacks. He must be willing to take both time and trouble. If he does not do so, his conclusions will be haphazard and untrustworthy. The wise man, when his background of knowledge in a particular situation is inadequate, *suspends judgment* until he is sufficiently informed.

This is one of the most important lessons we can learn. No one, be he ever so able, can know everything. Time and time again, situations arise in which our knowledge is defective. Under these conditions we have no sensible alternative but to suspend judgment. If we rush in with an impulsive decision, we not only take the risk of being hopelessly wrong, we also lose the opportunity to expand our ideas and develop our minds.

CHAPTER 12

THE PERIOD OF ADOLESCENCE

SOME people regard adolescence as a sort of distemper through which every child must pass in order to become an adult, but this is an exaggeration. By definition, adolescence is the period of life that roughly embraces the teens. The authorities, who usually treat the subject at great length, divide the period up into Early, Middle, and Late, but there will be no attempt to adhere to this division in the present chapter.

In our modern society, it is a very difficult and perplexing thing to be an adolescent—probably much more so than at any time in the past. Adolescents have always generated a good deal of heat in the breasts of their elders, but for reasons to be mentioned later they are now a source of greater irritation than ever. You will readily agree that this is a discouraging state of affairs that deserves thoroughgoing analysis.

THE ANCIENT QUARREL

It may be a little reassuring to know that adult disapproval of youth has existed since the beginning of recorded time. Scarcely one outstanding figure of the past has failed to comment bitterly on the youth of his own day. Here, by way of example, is a really blistering quotation: "The world is passing through troubled times. Young people of today think of nothing but themselves. They have no reverence for parents or old age. They talk as if they knew everything,

and what passes as wisdom with us is foolishness with them. As for girls, they are forward, immodest and unwomanly in speech, behaviour and dress."

Now when do you imagine that diatribe was written? Last week perhaps, or in Sunday's editorial? Well, it was written by Peter the Hermit in the eleventh century, and it can be matched by equally exasperated sentiments painted in hieroglyphics on the walls of ancient Egypt.

No doubt you have frequently encountered this attitude in dealings with your elders, and have asked yourself why it occurs. The answer is quite a simple one: you were born thirty years too late. To be in perfect harmony with your parents, you should have been born when they were. This answer, true though it is, stands in need of some elaboration.

In other parts of this book it is shown that everyone is conditioned by the environment into which he comes, that everyone is peculiarly a product of his own locality and *his own time*. The general environment is in continuous process of change: it varies a little from each year to the next, and in the space of a generation it is different in a thousand particulars. New scientific discoveries, new inventions, new events and new ideas change it almost out of recognition. So it follows that people who were in their teens thirty years ago were conditioned by an environment strongly contrasted with that which conditions people who are in their teens today.

Note now the outcome. The manners and tastes, the standards of conduct, and even the speech of youth are widely divergent from those of their parents. The point is that there is no escape from such divergencies—except by being born at the same time and into the same environment. All we can do is understand the situation, and ameliorate it to the best of our ability by being tolerant.

Let us look a little further into the matter—just to get a

faint idea of the conditions of life that existed thirty years or so ago. What was the Canada of those days like?

On the personal side, people were recovering from the effects of the First World War. They were resolutely and energetically gay. They danced the one-step to the tune of "K-K-K-Katy", waltzed to the romantic music of "Dreamy Moon", and still sang "Alexander's Rag-time Band" with every evidence of pleasure. Since cosmetics were not in use, women wore no 'faces' in those days, and anyone who did so was looked upon with disapproval and suspicion. Permanents were unknown, and bobbed hair was the prevailing fashion. Strangest of all, sheer silk stockings were just beginning to appear in the stores.

On the more external side, many things we now regard as necessities were lacking. Ice-boxes were used for household refrigeration; chesterfields had not yet supplanted sofas; radios were still at the crystal-set and ear-phone stage; automobiles were covered with brass attachments, and were regarded as a good deal of a luxury.

Contrast all this with your own ideas of enjoyable recreation, personal grooming, and a properly appointed home. Consider your disinclination to walk one step farther than you must. Give a thought to the way in which the automobile has increased mobility—and anonymity. Is it so very strange your parents do not see things through your eyes, nor you through theirs? And remember that thirty years from now you will be seeing the same situation from the other side!

ADOLESCENCE AS A SOCIAL OUTCOME

We turn now to the second cause of tension between adolescents and their elders—a cause altogether different from the first. This time we are dealing with a difficulty that stems right out of our present age.

To make a blunt statement: adolescence is not a physiological phenomenon but a social one. It is not so much a period of life as a period of social delay. It is a prolonging of childhood and a postponement of adulthood due to changes in the structure of our society. In a word, it is not a clear-cut stage of human development at all, but an outcome of our current way of living.

Among a great many primitive peoples—of whom the Samoans are a good illustration—the child becomes an adult in the space of a few months. With the onset of puberty, and after certain initiation ceremonies, he reaches economic independence, marries, and is a full-fledged member of the tribe.

In our own Victorian days, which are well within the memory of many people still alive, a rather similar state of affairs existed. Young people, brought up in large family groups that obtained their livelihood from the land, were doing their full share of work by the age of sixteen. The child merged easily into the man or the woman; early self-support and early marriage were the rule; and adolescence as we understand it did not occur. Such adolescence as did occur, was found solely among the sons and daughters of the rich.

What then are the social changes that have made adolescence so clearly defined and so general a phenomenon? The answer will be found in four facts which can be very simply stated, and which will now be set down for your thoughtful consideration:

1. The modern family is a small group, rather isolated from its kinsfolk, bound to no particular locality, and living for the most part under urban conditions. It is a unit of consumption rather than of production, since the father and often the mother are employed in

business or industry. Economic pressures tend to make it highly competitive, and therefore very sensitive to its status among surrounding families. It provides no occupational outlet for its children as did the large landed family of former times, but has to depend on their eventual employment by other people.

2. Technological advancement as applied to the processes of manufacture, and the increasing strength of labour unions, have debarred adolescents from the working world. Young people are no longer necessary to the sufficient production of goods and services, and since the depression of the early Thirties they are no longer welcome in the ranks of labour. They are therefore compelled to remain on the economic sidelines and—except for short stretches of seasonal work—to wait patiently for the years of adolescence to pass.
3. Educational facilities have been expanded to fill the gap. High schools are no longer reserved to a small pre-professional student group, but are organized to provide extended schooling for the whole adolescent population. Indeed, the modern high school is a revolutionized institution. It has been changed in the most radical way, and has made "Equality of educational opportunity" a fact as well as a democratic ideal.
4. For the reasons already given, the term of dependence has been lengthened. Boys and girls, who would formerly have been at work and earning the bulk of their own livelihood, are compelled by our altered social structure to remain for many years in a state of tutelage. They are subject to parental authority and dependent on the parental purse. At an age when they are physiologically mature and intellectually well developed, they are in many respects treated as

children, and are forced by circumstances to assume the role of children.

Now what is the natural upshot of all this? Serious frustration, of course—frustration the high schools are bending all their efforts to reduce. The practical outcome of frustration is readjustment, so our question becomes this: What forms of readjustment are currently adopted by young people?

It would be a hopeless task to trace all the turnings and twistings by which youth attempt to accommodate themselves to our new social framework, because these are immensely diverse and individual. The reaction of any particular adolescent depends on his own personality and on the insight or otherwise of his parents. Where such insight is wanting, his responses may vary all the way from extreme docility to outright rebellion.

There is, however, a type of adjustment so universal and so important as to demand special consideration, and to it we shall now turn.

THE PEER GROUP

Three main types of peer group are found: the play group of young children, the adolescent clique, and the neighbourhood gang. The second of these is the one with which we are here concerned, though we shall take time to glance at the third.

A peer group is an association of young people, who are more or less of an age, for purposes of companionship, recreation, and the free development of personality. The clique performs these functions at the high-school level. It includes both sexes and is in fact a miniature society which is excellently suited to serve the needs of its members.

Membership of a clique is usually a carefully guarded

privilege, and is based on social acceptability. Organization is quite informal in the sense that there are no elected officers, but very strong control is exercised for all that, and the behaviour of members is noted with a keen and critical eye. Penalties take the form of coolness or detachment, and may reach the extreme of ostracism; they often include the frankest sort of verbal castigation, but rarely go so far as physical violence. The clique is likely to have its headquarters in an up-to-date snack bar, where a juke-box has been installed, and where the proprietor plays up the adolescent trade.

Now there is really nothing in all this to arouse adult ire, except perhaps the natural spirits and cheerful horseplay of youth. There are, however, certain other characteristics of the clique that have far greater significance.

It has been mentioned that the clique is a miniature society. This is to say it develops its own customs, devises its own regulations, and establishes its own values. Because adolescents are debarred from active membership of our large society, they organize a small and separate society for themselves. By means of the clique, they gain a measure of worth and importance denied them by the adult world; they achieve a small place in the sun, feed their starved egos, and build up their self-respect.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the customs, regulations, and values of the clique are very different from those adhered to in our adult society. And here—note well—is the head and front of the modern difficulty. This is the prime cause of the present intensification of variance between adolescents and their elders. Standards of speech, costume, taste, manners and morals are set up by the clique; attitudes are sharply determined, and a uniform scale of clique values is established. Against this behaviour-pattern the adult world rather vainly contends with wrath and ridicule.

The strength of the clique—and perhaps its greatest weakness—is in the almost pathetic eagerness of young people for popularity and prestige. At all costs, they have to stand well in the eyes of their companions. To be accepted, to be ‘regular’, to be admired—these are more essential to adolescents than all other things put together. So they are prone to slavish conformity, and dare do nothing that will divide them from the group.

Why, you may ask, is the adolescent more sensitive than the adult in regard to such matters as approval and status? The answer is not far to seek. The adult, with his longer and more direct experience of the world, has had time to find himself. He is acquainted with his own standing and his own worth. He has achieved a position in the economic field, and his friendships are established. He is responsive to public opinion, of course, and conforms to the ways of his society, but he is rather independent in casual associations.

The adolescent, on the other hand, is by no means sure of his abilities and his social attractiveness. He has not yet had time to achieve anything of importance, and his standing in the world is still in doubt. He needs reassurance every day, so he is painfully careful to avoid everything that will lower him in the esteem of his peers. In fact, he is likely to lean over backwards in an effort to conform in every particular to the behaviour pattern of his clique. No matter how absurd some customs of the clique may be, they will nevertheless be more influential with him than the customs of his elders.

Do you see the bearing of all this? A little more courage and a little more emphasis on personal judgment are indicated. By all means conform—but not slavishly. Remember that the doubts you harbour about your own status and popularity are common to all adolescents. A show of firmness on your part—especially if it is backed up by sound

reasoning, and supported by wit or humour—may be all that is necessary to correct the more freakish conventions of your clique.

* * * * *

Very different indeed from the clique is the neighbourhood gang. This type of peer group is a one-sex organization whose primary characteristic is conflict. It is usually composed of adolescent boys or youths, and is often dominated by a forceful and daring leader. It congregates in a pool-room or a basement, or even an alley. It may or may not be delinquent, but in most cases it exercises a more than dubious influence over its members.

There is no need to stress the fact that the delinquent gang is a social problem of the gravest sort—a breeder of discord and crime. It is a problem, however, for which society must chiefly blame itself. Whereas the ordinary neighbourhood gang is in conflict with members of the opposite sex, with similar gangs in other streets, or with people who spring from a different race or profess another religion, the delinquent gang is in conflict with the forces of law and order.

Delinquency flourishes in what are called the 'interstitial areas' of cities—those in-between areas where residences are being crowded out by factories and railroad-tracks, where third-rate rooming-houses and unsavoury businesses abound, and where control by the police is intensely difficult. Such areas teem with the poor, the foreign-born, and the shiftless. They are the chosen haunt of the jackals and the vultures who prey upon their fellow-men. They afford the worst possible environment for childhood and youth, since they expose the young to dirt, poverty, and disease, and daily provide them with injurious patterns of behaviour.

The delinquent gang grows out of this tainted soil. Its

heroes are the boldest and most successful criminals of the locality. Its enemies are all decent people and the police. It serves an apprenticeship in petty crime, and then strikes out on a larger scale to engage in hold-up, murder, and general terrorization.

The responsibility lies squarely on the doorstep of society. The remedies are plainly to be seen. Resolute and thoroughgoing slum-clearance, the provision of parks and attractive places of recreation, the elimination of poverty, and the reclamation of the criminal—these are the only methods that can be used.

There is no suggestion here that such remedies are simple or that they can be applied overnight. The process of applying them will be long, tedious, and often discouraging. The present generation has made a start, but it will be for your generation to complete the task. If you do so, the delinquent gang will become an unpleasant memory, and the world will be a vastly better place for youth.

CHAPTER 13

LEARNING

BEHIND everything you are, as an efficient human being, and behind everything you can do, lies the great, fundamental process of learning. You were born without ideas and without skills—almost without personality. Today you are a cultivated member of society, courteous and honest, well-grounded in the arts of speech, reasonably well-informed, and able to do many practical things. You are a distinct person, different from anyone else in the world. The change—and it is a vast one—is due to the fact that you can learn.

Of all living creatures, man has this power in the greatest degree. Of all living creatures, he profits most by experience. He is born with a nervous system not nearly so well organized as that of a kitten or a puppy, and as a result he is much more helpless. But this original helplessness is his crowning advantage. Because his nervous system is not highly organized at birth, he is able to organize it in such a way as to meet the conditions of any environment in which he happens to live. He can form new and useful neural arcs from the beginning of his life to the end. His power to learn is infinitely greater than that of any kitten or puppy that ever existed.

To put the matter in plain terms: learning is the ability to profit by experience; and man, with his superior brain and his originally rather unorganized nervous system, can do this as no other creature can.


The process of learning is really that of connecting up

new arcs in the nervous structure—a process that is assisted in a variety of ways. The chapter on conditioning has thrown light on these, but there is a good deal more to be said. Let us look into the question from another angle.

PARTICIPATION

Here is a flat statement: *There is no learning without participation.* It will give us the necessary starting-point, and a few cases will make the meaning clear.

Murray and Ross are excellent friends and have many interests in common, but there is one they do not share. Murray is a keen checker-player and Ross cannot be bothered with the game. However, Ross has so great a friendship for Murray, he frequently goes with him to the checker-club and waits until he is ready to leave. Murray plays enthusiastically on these occasions, and Ross looks impatiently on.



Now there are many checker-openings, and Ross sees them repeatedly played—‘the Laird and Lady’, ‘the Black Doctor’, ‘the Switcher’, ‘the Dundee’, ‘the White Dyke’, and so on. The names become vaguely familiar to him, but after even a score of visits he is unable to play the moves that constitute a single one of them. They are all alike to him—meaningless and boring terms. Meantime, Murray has learned these openings well; he can play not only the first moves of each, but several moves more.

Why this striking difference between the two boys? Murray is no more intelligent than Ross. But Murray has *participated*, and Ross has not. Murray has concentrated his full attention on the game, and Ross has given his mind to other things. Ross has been present in body but absent in spirit; he has merely been exposed to checkers, and mere exposure produces no effective learning. Note then that participation means active sharing in a situation. The person who participates really identifies himself with what is going on.

You have probably seen all this working out in school. Bill Williamson—an intelligent fellow, and quite good in every other subject—gets consistently low grades in French. Why so? Because he does not *participate* in French. There may be any of a dozen reasons for his indifference. Perhaps the French teacher antagonizes him—perhaps he made a bad start in French and feels hopelessly out of his depth—perhaps he believes French is useless to him in the vocation he intends to follow—perhaps his family have imbued him with a prejudice against French people. Whatever the reason may be, the results are clear. Bill never gets down to real business with French. He remains passive and half-attentive. He takes no active share in the work that is being done.

The same principle holds good on the physical side of

life. Take, for instance, Norma Vincent, who is supposed to be learning to type. Her one ambition is to be a nurse, but her father has decided she must be a stenographer in his office. She feels frustrated and a bit rebellious. She sits several hours a day at the typewriter and makes scarcely any progress. And why? Because she is half-hearted and lacking in concentration. Because her mind is on something else. Because she is going through idle motions and not *participating*.

From these cases we see that participation is fundamental to learning. We also see that *interest leads to participation*. So it becomes necessary to go a step deeper and examine interest.

INTEREST



You do not require to be told what interest is, but it is worth while to find out something of how it arises and how it develops.

Interest arises out of need. Our very first interests have to do with food, bodily comfort, sleep, and physical movement; and these interests are retained right through life. Quite soon we begin to need attention and entertainment. We realize ourselves as distinct personalities, and our egos begin to develop. We need to be important, to be secure, to have companionship, and to understand the things that make up our world. All the foundations of our future interests are thus laid down.

But our interests do not remain simple: they develop according to the ways in which our needs can be satisfied by our environment. Everyone needs food, and everyone is interested in food, but not necessarily in the same kind of food. Where, as in China, the environment provides rice, the interest in food develops into a strong preference for rice. In Scotland the developed interest might be for

oatmeal, in the Arctic for walrus-meat, and in the South Sea Islands for bananas. Even in two neighbouring families, food interests can develop differently: one family may go in heavily for sea-food and the other for vegetable salads. In the first, the child will be fond of clam-chowder and fish-cakes; in the second, the child will dote on lettuce and tomatoes.

Exactly the same process can be seen in the case of our need to be important. We are all interested in satisfying it, but our ways of doing so are developed in accordance with the opportunities afforded by our varying environments. Among the Spartans, a child satisfied his need for importance by becoming a first-rate fighter; among the Athenians, by becoming an orator. A child born into a highly musical family is almost compelled to develop an interest in music—imagine a little Bach who told his astonished parents he hated the sound of an organ! The son of a radio-engineer expands his ego by developing an interest in his father's work-bench in the basement—thereby obtaining his father's delighted admiration and respect. A boy whose friends are baseball enthusiasts has no option, if he would hold their regard, but to become a baseball enthusiast himself.

You will realize from these illustrations that interests are growing and changing things. In some respects they resemble trees. They are firmly rooted in original needs, but they branch out in various directions. Some branches develop and flourish; others grow for a while, but afterwards decay. Whether tree branches flourish or decay depends on the conditions they meet—the amount of sunlight, the action of the wind, the effect of rain, the breakage wrought by animals. Whether interests flourish or decay depends on conditions in the human environment—the natural resources, the family attitudes, the enthusiasms of friends, the chosen vocation.

The thing to remember is that interests are never fixed and changeless. Many of your interests of five years ago have pretty well vanished, and five years from now you will have acquired interests you certainly do not have today. You cannot doubt this. What would you think of a group of middle-aged business-men who got together every noon hour to exchange cigarette cards? And what would you think of a group of high-school students who spent all their spare time discussing foreign exchange? Not only are our interests suitable to our age and condition, they can be cultivated or laid aside as changing circumstances dictate.

INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC INTERESTS

An attempt has been made—not altogether successfully—to classify interests under two main headings: intrinsic and extrinsic. These words are so commonly used, you should have a clear idea of what they mean. Intrinsic interest occurs when you are engaged in an activity for its own sake; extrinsic interest occurs when you are engaged in an activity for the sake of something else. The first activity is an end in itself; the second is a means to an end:

Here are some illustrations. A hungry boy sits down to a meal. He eats for the sake of eating, so his interest is intrinsic. Another boy, who has blunted his appetite with two apples and a half a pound of chocolates, comes to the dinner table and eats for the sake of lulling his mother's suspicions. In his case the interest in eating is extrinsic—he eats for the sake of something else.

Mary Seldon is writing an essay. She loves to choose exactly suitable words and to coin clever phrases. Her interest in essay-writing is intrinsic. But Margaret Simpson is writing an essay because she knows there will be plenty of trouble if she neglects to do so. Margaret's interest in essay-writing is extrinsic.

Two young insurance salesmen are making a great success of their work, but their motives are different. Dick is tremendously keen on the insurance business. He believes everyone should carry as much insurance as possible, and he regards his own efforts as an important public service. Roger, on the other hand, is in love and anxious to marry. To him, the insurance business is a good way of making the necessary money. He would be quick to accept a well-paid position in any other line. Now in which case is the interest intrinsic, and in which extrinsic?

All this seems very simple, but there are dozens of cases in which the dividing line is not so sharply drawn. Here is an artist, Allan Alcott, who completely loses himself in the painting of a portrait. So far his interest is intrinsic. But the matter does not stop there. Painting is his livelihood: he expects to be paid for it. Also, he wants his work to be admired. His prestige and financial standing depend on the skill with which he wields his brush. Therefore, he is urged on by extrinsic interests too: his work is a means to an end as well as an end in itself.

This mixture of interests is our common experience. We usually do things not for one reason but for many. Why, for instance, does a girl dust her room? Because she likes it to be clean (intrinsic)—because she is a tidy creature (intrinsic)—because she has a new bed-spread (which?)—because her mother insists on it (extrinsic)—because she is giving a tea and her friends will be taking off their coats in her room (extrinsic).

Again, why does a boy learn mathematics? Because he enjoys the subject (intrinsic)—because he is good at it (which?)—because he admires or fears his teacher (extrinsic)—because mathematics is on the school curriculum (extrinsic)—because mathematics is necessary to the profession he intends to follow (which?).

In any given case, it would seem that our interests are numerous and varied. All that can be said is that sometimes the intrinsic element predominates, and sometimes the extrinsic element. Even the hungry boy eating his dinner may prefer one food to another because he thinks it will have a greater effect on his muscular strength, or because his mother has a special pride in the way she cooks it. There can be no doubt that in the main, intrinsic interest is more powerful than extrinsic interest; and the more intrinsic an interest can be, the better for learning. But it would be foolish to lose sight of the plain fact that extrinsic interest is always present in some degree, and is essential for most of the things we have to learn.

Let us now connect up this discussion with the previous one. We noted these two fundamental things: learning results from participation; and participation is the outcome of interest. Where something must be learned, therefore, it is necessary that interest be aroused. If, in such a situation, intrinsic interest is either slight or lacking, extrinsic interest must somehow be brought to bear. If, to put the matter bluntly, a boy has no inner urge to spell correctly, he must be persuaded or charmed or shamed or coerced into doing so. If a man refuses to be honest because he has a deep respect for honesty, society compels him to be honest in order to keep his liberty or to save his skin. In each of these instances, learning is absolutely necessary; since interest does not come from within, it must be aroused from without.

Having examined the basis of learning (participation and interest), we can go on to discuss the two kinds of learning you most frequently use, namely: rote-learning and problem-solving. As the second of these—problem-solving—was considered rather fully in the previous chapter, very little will require to be said about it here.

ROTE-LEARNING

Rote-learning, which is commonly called 'drill', is the method we use to acquire both the facts of knowledge and the patterns of movement that underlie muscular skill. A child learning the multiplication table, a medical-student studying the elements of anatomy, a girl learning to use a needle, a business-man trying to become a golfer—all these people employ rote-learning. Even a dog, learning to sit up and beg, is trained in the selfsame fashion.

There are three things to know about this method, and three things only. It calls for concentrated attention, for frequent repetition, and for exact similarity of verbal or muscular response. In a word, it is our way of establishing a habit.

Here is a case for your consideration. A girl is learning to use a typewriter. What, first and foremost, is her interest in doing so? She has several interests: she wants to be a stenographer; she wants to be independent; she takes pride in her ability as a student; she thinks highly of her teacher; she looks forward to helping her family. All in all, her interest is strong—so participation follows. She puts her whole mind on the business of learning to type: her attention is strong and steady.

Second, she takes care to get a great deal of practice. She not only does what she is called upon to do, but often manages to put in an extra half-hour at the machine.

Third, she is careful, by going slowly at first and gradually speeding up, to make none but correct movements. She watches like a hawk for every error, and tries very hard not to repeat it. She makes accuracy one of her chief goals.

Now, if this girl has average brains and reasonable muscular co-ordination, nothing on earth will prevent her from becoming an excellent typist. She is well aware of the

three things needful to effective rote-learning, and she gives each of them its due.

Note, however, what happens when any one of the three elements of rote-learning is ignored. First: Attention. You are memorizing a poem that bores you. You go through it over and over again, reading the words and thinking about other things. At the end of fifteen minutes, you are surprised to find you are quite unable to repeat it correctly. Second: Repetition. You are memorizing a poem you like very well, but you have no time to go through it more than half a dozen times. Next day, it has practically vanished from your mind. Third: Correctness. Again you are memorizing an attractive poem, but you do not take the trouble to check up closely on the actual words you are repeating. As a result, you afterwards repeat the poem incorrectly—not as the poet wrote it, but with variations of your own.

PROBLEM-SOLVING

This section must be looked on as an addition to what has already been said about thinking and judgment. Problem-solving of every sort follows the five steps we have discussed, and can be analysed into those steps without any difficulty. What we are concerned with here is problem-solving, not so much as a way of reaching decisions, but rather as a way of learning new things.

The simplest illustrations of this kind of learning are to be found in animal behaviour. There is, for example, the famous story of the Canada porcupine, which learned to reach out with its right paw for cabbage. The problem, of course, was none of the porcupine's choosing, but the porcupine solved it. Here is how it occurred.

The porcupine's manner of eating was to sit upright, and to reach out for food with one paw or the other. The experi-

menter stood in front of the animal, and held in his hand a bowl containing small pieces of cabbage. He offered a piece to the porcupine and the animal reached for it with his left paw. Thereupon the experimenter dropped the cabbage back into the bowl. Cabbage was offered in this way twenty times—each time the porcupine reached out with his left paw, it got nothing; but each time it reached out with its right paw, it received and ate the cabbage.

Now note the learning. In the first series of twenty offerings, the porcupine reached out only seven times with its right paw. In succeeding series the results were as follows: second, fourteen rights; third, fourteen rights; fourth, sixteen rights; fifth, nineteen rights; sixth and all others, twenty rights. Quite obviously, the porcupine learned.

Now let us examine the process in the light of the five steps with which we are already acquainted.

1. The porcupine was hungry and therefore interested in eating. If it had not been hungry, it would not have reached out at all. Its interest was in the satisfaction of a need, and was intrinsic to the matter in hand.

2. The porcupine did not examine the situation in the first place as a human being would have done. It was eagerly aware of the cabbage in the bowl, but it knew nothing of the problem it would be called upon to solve.

3. It reached out with the left paw—a reasonable trial, since such behaviour had been successful in the past.

4. The trial produced no satisfactory results—no eating followed.

5. There was no conscious rejection of left-paw reaching by the porcupine, because it made the same response many times afterwards—but a small doubt must have come into its mind.

Another piece of cabbage was offered to the porcupine, and it returned to step three.

3. It reached out again with the left paw, and again its hunger tension was unreduced.

4. The small doubt was slightly strengthened.

A third piece of cabbage was offered, and once more a return was made to step three.

3. This time it reached out with the right paw. It received and ate the cabbage, and the hunger tension was by so much reduced.

4. Still without real understanding, the porcupine became more inclined to favour right-paw reaching and to avoid the left-paw response.

Thus, in course of time and after many trials, the desired learning took place.

What does the porcupine experiment show? It shows that learning can occur as a result of rather blind trial and error, so long as a successful response is found. Much of our learning is of this kind. Although in human beings there is a strong tendency to know exactly what is wanted, and to run over various alternatives in the mind before putting one of them into practice; nevertheless, we also learn, where the situation is a bit obscure, by trying this and that mode of response in rather blind hope that something will work.

Here are some commonplace cases of the process. A woman goes into a stationer's store to buy a fountain-pen. She has a general idea of what she wants, but by no means a definite one. The stock is brought out, and she looks each pen over. Having decided on the style, she turns her attention to the nibs, and *tries out* half a dozen pens, one after another, by writing her name on a pad provided for

the purpose. The sixth pen seems to have a satisfactory nib, and she buys it.

A man goes to live in a new town, and has to find his way about. The probability is he does not buy a plan of the town and study it. Instead of doing this, he is likely to *try out* various ways of reaching his various destinations. After a few weeks, he is quite at home, and knows all the best and shortest routes to the places he wishes to reach.

A student is working on a trigonometry problem. Being no expert, he has only a vague idea of what he is aiming to do and of the way to find the solution. He has memorized a number of formulae, however, and he *tries them out*, one after the other, until one of them produces what he thinks is the right answer. Next time he meets a similar problem he will probably apply this formula first—and to that extent he has learned something.

Every time we run into a practical difficulty, and every time we have to teach ourselves (without benefit of instruction), we are apt to use this rather blind trial-and-error method. The less blind it is, the better for us! The more we can turn a problem over in our minds and draw upon the resources of our experience for its solution, the more likely we are to succeed. We can learn by trial and error, of course, but when we do so, we are working more at the animal than the human level—we are solving our problems after the manner of the porcupine.

LIMITS OF LEARNING

Learning is limited in two ways: by nature and by individual need. The first is physiological and depends on our physical structure (including the brain); the second is practical, and depends on the situation in which the individual is placed. We shall examine each of these in turn.

Physiological limits. There is a theory that we can accom-

plish anything we truly wish to do, provided we try hard enough. It is ten thousand pities this theory cannot be relied on to work in all cases. The fallacy is just this: no matter how hard we try, we can accomplish only those things that are within our physical and mental powers. Our powers are limited. They are limited by the structure of our bodies and the quality of our brains.

Consider the field of sport. How many boys desire with their whole hearts to be brilliant athletes? And how many succeed? There is no doubt they try with all their might. But sheer desire and practice are not enough. Length of limb, muscular make-up, constitutional strength and endurance, smooth co-ordination, quick reaction time—these and many other things are necessary to athletic distinction. Some people are cut out to be swimmers, others to be runners; some are built for jumping, others for wrestling. Only once in a long time do we find an all-round athlete—a man whose whole bodily structure is so perfect, he is able to become expert in almost any activity.

It must also be noted that even in the twenties, structural changes begin to set in. A gradual decline in expertness begins to make itself visible. Few athletes are able to continue far into the thirties. "Youth must be served." The young man can play many games; the middle-aged man has to confine himself to golf and lawn-bowling; the old man must be contented with walking; the very old man sits by the fireside. Indeed, even in games such as golf and lawn-bowling, young men chiefly win. Every year, after our peak is reached, the physiological limits close gradually in upon us and reduce our physical efficiency.

Almost exactly the same principles hold good in the mental field. There is, as you know, a tremendous variation between individuals in the matter of intelligence. Problems easy for some people are completely beyond the range of

others. You know also that each occupation calls for a certain minimum I.Q., that a boy with an I.Q. of 100 has no chance in the world—try as he may—of becoming a successful medical doctor.

This is just one of those facts we have to accept. Very few of us can be first-class scientists, engineers, poets, or professors. We must cut our coat according to our cloth, and make our efforts along the lines of our capacities. To act otherwise is to court failure and disappointment. The wise man finds out what he can do best, and then does that thing with every bit of enthusiasm and energy he can muster.

The effects of age, however, are not so obvious in the mental as in the physical field. The probability is that intelligence—the sheer ability to solve problems—begins to decline somewhere in the middle thirties, and continues to decline steadily though slowly until death. But the loss is balanced, and often more than balanced, by the continual development of the mind. The older person is not so quick to solve new problems, to learn new things, and to accommodate himself to new situations. But on the other hand, he has had a wider experience and possesses far more ideas. He is rarely faced by problems that are totally new. He has a growing background of information that covers most of the situations he is likely to meet, and as a result he may even become more capable intellectually as his age advances. The lessening of intelligence and speed is offset by the increase of knowledge and judgment.

Practical limits. Of the thousands of things we can do, all but a very few are done at a level of efficiency far below the one we could reach if we cared to practise. This is well known; and though at first sight it looks like a criticism of our willingness to improve, it is really nothing of the sort. It is a necessary outcome of the fact that we do not live for ever.

Consider your own case. Could you by earnest effort raise the level of your skill as a shoelace-tier? If so, why do you not do it? Would it be reasonable to criticize you for not tying shoelaces at the very top-notch of your capacity?

Your answer, of course, is that you now tie shoelaces well enough *for all practical purposes*, and that the time necessary for improvement in shoelace-tying can much better be given to practising something of more importance to your life. And this is an excellent answer. It applies to many things besides shoelace-tying—to adding, and singing, and swimming, and cycling, and indeed to most of the things we do.

The point is that expertness in any line is only arrived at by continual and concentrated practise, and can only be maintained by the same arduous method. A champion golfer is one who has devoted years to the single-minded study of golf, who has learned it hour by hour and stroke by stroke. In order to remain a champion, he must keep on doing this. If he neglects to practise for a single week, the effect will be noticeable in his game.

No matter what the activity may be—piano-playing, mathematics, table-tennis, or chess—to become and remain an expert requires a tremendous expenditure of time and effort. Other activities take second place or are pushed aside altogether. We pay a heavy price for developing our full capacity in any one of the things we do.

It is, therefore, necessary for us to be practical. Life is short and the time at our disposal is limited. We have to arrange our activities in the order of their importance, and carry each of them to the standard of efficiency its importance demands. The things that mean most to our success and happiness must be brought up to a high level, and those that mean little can be brought only to a level high enough for practical purposes.

There is an important point, however, that should be made. We are living in an age of specialization, and there is a strong tendency for people to give their whole minds to one activity at the expense of everything else. We have physicians who are so wrapped up in their profession, they are unable to maintain an ordinary conversation on general topics—musicians who are so obsessed with music, they have a sort of contempt for all other pursuits—machinists who can think intelligently about nothing but machines. These people, expert and useful though they may be, have needlessly narrowed their minds. From the social point of view they are all bores together.

There is, you see, a happy mean in this business of selecting certain activities for continual and concentrated practice. You should develop yourself in one main direction certainly; but in order to be a well-balanced and socially attractive human being, you should develop yourself in other directions as well.

CHAPTER 14

HOW TO STUDY

THIS will be a short chapter on a most important subject—short, because the information it contains is simple and to the point. Failure in school and university, and in life itself, is due to many causes, of which insufficient intelligence, indifference, and laziness are probably the chief. But when this is said, there still remains a large percentage of failure that results from plain ignorance of the way to study. This chapter, therefore, in spite of its brevity, may be of real practical value.

First and foremost, study is a habit and has to be acquired.

It must be linked up with a definite and rather invariable routine. It should be carried on at a set time and for a set period, and in the same place from day to day. The more routine of this sort you can establish, the better.

Physical conditions should be right. There should be good lighting; a comfortable but not too comfortable chair; a roomy desk or table; a handy arrangement of books and materials; and as far as possible, *no distractions*.



Study must be planned. Each subject must be allotted a certain amount of time (measured in minutes): strong subjects being held down to a shorter period, and weak subjects being apportioned a longer one. A definite order of subjects should be established and you should adhere to that order.

MEMORIZATION

There are two rules that must be applied:

1. Success comes from attentive, frequent, and exact repetition.
2. Several short and intensive practise periods are better than one long one.

PROBLEM-SOLVING

In problem-solving, put a tremendous emphasis on step two of the thinking process. Read the problems with the utmost care, and several times over. Make absolutely certain you have examined every detail of what is given, and have an exact understanding of what is required. Comb your mind for all the sequences you possess that relate to the subject. If necessary, consult books for new ideas on the matter. Leave no stone unturned till you believe every item of necessary information has been brought to light.

Then, having thought of a suggested solution (hypothesis), give your whole



mind to the testing process of step four. Lay the hypothesis against your background of information, make sure it accounts for all the facts of the problem, and accept it only after the most rigorous trial.

If you do these things with honest determination, you will soon find yourself growing in power. The great secret of success in problem-solving is method. When you have established the method and know exactly how to proceed, you are well on the high road to mastery and achievement.

REVIEW

The most important factor in study is constant review. It is a human weakness to do a thing once and consider it done—a weakness to which most of us are prone. Real learning requires repetition. Without repetition, even what we seem to know best fades out of the mind.

In every subject you study, therefore, you must allow time for review of previous work. Every night you must go back over what you have already learned. Probably about a third of the time allotted to the study of a subject should be devoted to review. If you are studying literature, for example, and are allowing thirty minutes for that purpose, take ten minutes every night to review the poems you have studied on former occasions. By doing this you will acquire a familiarity with the subject that will surprise you, and you will acquire it with the greatest ease.

Treat every subject this way, and the need for 'cramming' will soon become a thing of the past. In fact, examinations, which you have so far faced with a certain amount of anxiety, will come to be quite satisfactory, and even pleasant occasions. They will cease to be a means of disclosing your ignorance, and become an opportunity for revealing your knowledge.

MOTIVE

No effective learning occurs without interest. Interest, therefore, must be cultivated. The best form of interest (intrinsic) arises out of the actual work you are doing; but interest in the work as an avenue of approach to some other goal (extrinsic) is also a powerful motive. When your interest in some compulsory study is low, you must make a genuine effort to raise it. Here are some of the questions you can ask yourself, with this essential end in view:

1. Does the subject lack interest simply because you are doing badly in it? If so, better study habits will work a cure.
2. Are you the sort of person who is satisfied to fail, or do you take pride in respectable achievement? Does your self-respect demand better grades?
3. How does failure affect you in the eyes of others? Are you willing to be regarded as stupid or as a 'quitter'?
4. Is mastery of this subject necessary to entering and succeeding in the vocation on which you have set your heart? If so, how do you propose to get along without it?

Think these questions over. They do not cover all the ground, but they do cover a good deal of it. Answer them honestly, and perhaps a new determination will take possession of your mind.

CHAPTER 15

PERSONALITY

Nothing adds more interest and zest to life than the fact that everywhere around us are people with different personalities. There is no need for us ever to be bored. The great stage of the world is filled with colourful actors, many of whom challenge our attention and excite our imagination. Only a very stupid or self-centred man can look out upon his fellows without keen pleasure and a sense of varied entertainment. Even the people we cannot love—like the villain in the melodrama!—act out their parts and lend vigour to the play.

From a rather unscientific but nevertheless helpful point of view, your personality can be defined as your effect on other people. A more correct definition will be considered later. Think of this one for a little while, however, and exercise your mind on the question of what your general effect may be.

To begin with, are you reasonably popular? Do your acquaintances smile happily when they see you coming—or do they make an obvious effort to greet you courteously? When you go visiting, does your host beg you to stay a little longer—or does he hasten to bring your hat and coat at your first mention of leaving? When you are about to meet someone on the street, does he speed up his pace, and hail you a shade too heartily as he hurries past? When you join a group, are your opinions eagerly sought—or does an awkward silence follow your arrival? Are you often invited to



attend parties and join clubs and go on hikes—or are you included once in a while out of politeness?

If, after considering these questions and others like them, you feel you are as popular as most, why, very well and good. But if you are forced to decide the other way, you had better do some serious thinking. Remember this, however: many people have been unpopular before you, and not a few of them have made a good recovery. Here is a list of questions that may help you to diagnose your trouble, and may possibly suggest a method of cure:

1. Are you physically acceptable? Are you particular in your personal habits, or have you some objectionable or boorish mannerisms? Are you well groomed? Is your clothing suitable to the various situations you meet? If you are a girl, do you use cosmetics with discretion and good taste?

2. Is your voice pleasing and well modulated, or is it strident and harsh? It may surprise you to know you have

never heard your own voice as it actually is—it sounds quite different from the inside. Is your English up to the mark? Do you say 'done' for 'did', 'seen' for 'saw', 'come' for 'came'? Do you commonly leave the 'g' out of 'ing'? If so, you had better make a determined effort to improve.

3. What about your manners? Do you go round with a superior air? Are you inconsiderate and curt? Or are you merely rough and uncouth? Good manners, remember, are the oil of society, and it will go badly with you if you neglect them.

4. Are you by any chance a bore—a person who does all the talking and none of the listening? Are you dogmatic, or bombastic or egoistic? Do you raise your voice and talk people down? Do you insist on discussing your own interests and doings, or do you lend a patient ear to the interests and doings of others? Does a word of commendation spring readily to your lips, or is it much easier for you to criticize and 'damn with faint praise'?

5. Do you tend to be a solitary and rather unsocial person, going heavily in for pursuits—such as reading and stamp-collecting—that can be enjoyed without companions? This is not a tendency to encourage. If you cut yourself off from other people, you will find it harder and harder to mix with them as you grow older. Social intercourse is an art that has to be practised.

There is much to be said, as you can see, for viewing personality as 'effect on other people', and we shall return to it in some of the succeeding chapters. In this one, however, the main emphasis must be put on the more scientific approach, and to this we must now address ourselves.

THE SCIENTIFIC VIEW OF PERSONALITY

Personality is properly defined as our prevailing tendencies of reaction—in other words, as the outcome of all

our habits. As we grow up, and our habits of thought, of feeling, and of muscular activity become established, we behave in a rather consistent and predictable way. As our habit systems become more and more unified, our personalities develop. The key word here is 'consistency'. In the well-developed personality no habit is seriously in conflict with any other—we can be relied upon to act in definite and consistent ways in various situations.

Here, for example, is a man who has been embittered by failure. He has lost confidence in himself, and cannot endure to see the success of others. Note the consistency of his behaviour. Every challenge to his power to make an adjustment—the offer of a better job, moving into another house, meeting a new group of people—fills him with foreboding and fear. He is pessimistic and gloomy. Probably he escapes from such problems by developing a hollow cough or a bad heart, because no one is cruel enough to expect much from a sick man. But let anyone else get along in the world, and listen to his comments! His talk is then of nothing but 'pull' and 'graft' and 'barefaced impudence'. For a moment or two he becomes quite vigorous—but he soon settles back into his usual whining self. His personality, unpleasant though it is, is quite consistent. You could predict his behaviour in most situations without much trouble.

Again, here is a youth of seventeen, good-looking, intelligent, and athletic. His mother, who is a widow, and his younger sisters fairly dote on him. He attends a small high school, where he is far and away the outstanding boy. Even his teachers defer to him. So his chief characteristic has come to be a vain and arrogant sense of his own importance. He assumes the air of a monarch and distributes his favours with regal superiority. But what happens when he is balked? What happens when another boy with fewer

graces, but with much greater academic ability and athletic prowess comes to that school? You can safely be left to answer the question yourself.

It would seem that in most of us, due of course to our experience of life, some one attitude comes to be central to the personality. In the first case described above, this central attitude was pessimism and envy; in the second it was conceit. One might say every personality has its peculiar flavour, an individual tang that attaches to every item of its behaviour. Thus, some people are optimistic, others timid, and still others suspicious. Some people are narrowly conventional, and others are boldly original. This idea must not be carried too far, but within limits it is a useful one.

The definition of personality as being the resultant of all our habits may have struck you as unsatisfactory in one respect. At first sight, it seems to ignore the physical side. "What about facial and bodily appearance?" you have probably been asking. "What effect do such things as these have on personality?"

The answer, of course, is that they have a great deal. But their effect is chiefly seen in the habits they have assisted in forming. A very short man, for instance, forms habits that are greatly influenced by the shortness of his stature. He may cultivate a deep voice and an aggressive manner; he may wear high heels and high-crowned hats; he may develop a contempt for all men over six feet; or he may become a first-class chess-player. There is literally no end to the things he may do as a direct result of the fact that he is short.

Facial appearance also can have far-reaching effects. The beautiful girl, for example, has an easy way in the world. A smile and an attractive suggestion of helplessness will work wonders for her. So she may coast pleasantly along on her good looks, trouble her intelligence very little, and de-

velop habits of easy-going dependence. Sadly enough, the habits often remain after the beauty has departed, and at fifty she may be a pitiable figure. There is, mark you, no necessity that any of this should happen to her—but good looks can be a curse as well as a blessing.

It has become customary of late to classify people according to two main types: introvert and extrovert. Now, although nothing is more dangerous than to label people and put them into pigeon-holes, this idea of introverts and extroverts is of great value. At least, it throws light on two contrary directions in which personality may develop.

The introvert is one who turns in upon himself, one whose interests are predominantly personal. The extrovert is one who turns out upon the world, one whose interests are predominantly social.

Here are some of the ways in which the two types of personality work out. The introvert needs few friends, and is quite uncomfortable in a social group. He hates prominence of the public sort, goes through agony if he has to make a speech, and prefers to be alone both in work and play. His opinions, however, are apt to be rather radical, because he insists on thinking everything out for himself. With one or, at most, two companions, he is often passionately argumentative and critical. In brief, he is a very bad mixer.





The extrovert is 'hail fellow, well met' with everyone. He has no self-consciousness about making speeches or heading a sing-song, or running for office, or anything else. He loves a crowd, and likes to have people around him no matter what he is doing. He takes things as they are, and does not trouble his head with theories. As a result he is inclined to be conventional and conservative in his views. He takes happily to athletics, danc-

ing, hikes, and all forms of group activity. The one thing he cannot abide is to be long alone.

If you look round among your acquaintances, you will find some with strongly introverted and some with strongly extroverted tendencies. But most of the people you know cannot be classified either as out-and-out introverts or as out-and-out extroverts. Most people are somewhere between the two extremes, being introverted in certain respects and extroverted in others. In fact, the word 'ambivert' has been invented to describe them. An ambivert is one who turns both ways, within and also without, and the great majority of us do precisely that. We are reasonably contented when alone, and reasonably happy in company.

Should anything be done about extreme introversion? Probably it should. There is a real danger it will develop into absolute inability to cope with the conditions of normal life. The extreme introvert should somehow be coaxed into

the milder forms of group activity, and allowed to find out through experience that social intercourse is not terrifying.

The extreme extrovert will probably get along quite well. His main problem has to do with the times he is alone. At such times—and they are bound to occur—he is restless, bored and miserable. The remedy for him is to cultivate some resources of his own; to take up reading, or music, or even solitaire.

MEASURING PERSONALITY

We now come to the main way in which personality is scientifically appraised, namely, by the rating of traits. Our traits are the prevailing ways in which we behave—our habits, in short. A short list of traits will give you a clear idea of what is meant. You must note, however, that this list is by no means complete, but is only a selection from the very large number that could be presented.

Here is the list: Intelligence, Cheerfulness, Loyalty, Fairness, Industry, Modesty, Tact, Truthfulness, Open-Mindedness, Artistic Appreciation.


These, let us say, are ten exceedingly important traits of the personality. Anyone who has them in a high degree is a social asset; anyone who lacks them is a social liability. But a vital question remains to be answered. How shall they be measured? Is there any scientific way in which the appraisal can be made?

Several methods are in use: the objective test; the questionnaire; the interview; the self-rating-scale; and the rating-scale as scored by other people. These methods vary greatly in accuracy—and of course in scientific value. Only one of them, the objective test for the measurement of intelligence, can be regarded as thoroughly reliable. Second to it in reliability is the rating-scale scored by other people. Under carefully controlled circumstances, the remaining three pro-


duce trustworthy results. The interview is commonly used in business and industry as a means of selecting personnel; the questionnaire has proved reasonably accurate as used in such cases as the Gallup Poll; and the self-rating-scale, if not very reliable, has at least the advantage of making the subject appraise himself as coolly and honestly as he can.

By way of illustration, let us examine a rating-scale intended to measure the ten traits listed above. Each trait, you will note, is represented by a line running from zero to ten. The rater marks a cross on each line according to his best judgment. It is our experience that the most reliable results are obtained when no fewer than five raters do the marking individually, and an average is struck for each trait. It is also rather a common practice—not followed in this case—to alternate the values of the lines, by making the first run from zero to ten, the second from ten to zero, and so on. This helps to cut down the carry-over from each trait to the next.


1. INTELLIGENCE




2. CHEERFULNESS



3. LOYALTY



4. FAIRNESS



5. INDUSTRY

Utterly lazy	Easy-going	Average	Hard- working	Indefatig- able
1	2	4	6	8
				10

6. MODESTY

Crudely boastful	Inclined to brag	Average	Rarely brags	Very re- served about achievements
1	2	4	6	8
				10

7. TACT

Crude and clumsy	Often hurts people	Average	Careful not to hurt	Never hurts people
1	2	4	6	8
				10

8. TRUTHFULNESS

Hopeless liar	Frequently lies	Average	Very honest	Never lies
1	2	4	6	8
				10

9. OPEN-MINDEDNESS

Fossilized	Rarely changes an opinion	Average	Welcomes new ideas	Eager to learn
1	2	4	6	8
				10

10. ARTISTIC APPRECIATION

A complete boor	Taste rather low	Average	Very good taste	Keenly artistic
1	2	4	6	8
				10

One or two notes on the foregoing scale are in order. First of all, it would be much better to rate intelligence by means of a scientific test. Secondly, the descriptive wordings are open to argument—different people would probably select different ways of describing the various amounts of each trait. Thirdly, individual raters might disagree quite widely in their marking, for the excellent reason that they have not observed the person concerned in identically the same situations. Thus, an average of five or more ratings is imperative. Fourthly, the traits are not all of equal importance. Curiously enough, the most important in the above

list, from the social point of view, is generally acknowledged to be 'Cheerfulness'.

And now, sufficient has been said about personality to give you a sound working knowledge both of its nature and of the means used for its measurement. Much more, of course, could be said. Fair success has been obtained in measuring emotional balance, in investigating interests, in discovering vocational aptitudes, and in appraising social efficiency. Every year, something new and useful is added to our techniques. But when all is said and done, it must be admitted that personality does not lend itself to exact and quantitative analysis. Apart from the single trait of intelligence, we still have to use a great deal of individual judgment in approaching it. The truth probably is that we shall never be able to analyse a human being as we analyse a chemical compound. We shall have to be content with shrewd guesses and reasonable approximations.

CHAPTER 16

ENHANCING THE EGO

THIS chapter is included in the rather optimistic belief it will be good for you! It may strike you as slightly cynical, but such is not its spirit. It is an attempt to seize upon the one truly universal human weakness, and to hold that weakness up for your rueful scrutiny. For every human being—in season and out of season; by fair means or foul; with crudeness or with subtlety—is continually enhancing his ego. Even you and I, modest creatures though we hope to be thought, do this at least a hundred times a day.

There has been much argument about man's supreme motive. He has, of course, a great many motives arising from his numerous and varied needs. No final answer has been given. If, however, any one motive stands above the rest because of its frequent appearance, it is enhancement of the ego. The desire for importance, for prestige, for popularity, for social approval—this desire is apparently deathless and universal. No matter how insignificant or how beaten down by failure a person may be, he can still find reason for pride—and he can still put that reason forward as a way of impressing others.

Now before going on to be a little hard on ego-enhancement, we had better admit—and very definitely admit—its indispensable value to man. A man's ego includes his feeling of self-hood, his sense of worth, his respect for himself as a human being. If he had no sense of his own dignity, he could hardly be called a man. Lacking a well-developed ego, he would go creeping through the world without

courage and without ambition—a sly, spineless, furtive creature, useless to himself and to society. Even a dog has to have some self-respect and dignity. *A measure of ego-enhancement is an absolute necessity to everyone.* What is being criticized in this chapter is not the thing we must all do, but the exaggerated way in which most of us do it.

In childhood, enhancement of the ego is carried on in the most blatant fashion. Small children are out-and-out individualists. They forever ‘stand screaming on the top of the third vowel’. Their most frequent expressions are, “See what I can do”, “Watch me do this”, and “My dolly is nicer than yours”. When they play together, each one goes his or her own way; and their conversation is chiefly a series of unrelated, bragging statements.

As they grow older, they find out by experience that social life requires some amelioration of all this. Moreover, they begin to have more interest in the sayings and doings of others. So their ego-enhancement becomes less obvious and less aggressive.

From this point to old age, ego-enhancement is done by most people with increasing decorum and subtlety. There are a few, of course, who continue to brag with all the brazen effrontery of small children, but the rest of us learn to do it with a little discretion. The arrival of old age, however, very often brings a change for the worse, and old people are apt to bore their companions with long and tediously repeated stories of their own achievements and successes.

With this introduction to the subject, let us now look at the ways in which enhancement of the ego is most commonly done. The idea is that you apply the analysis to yourself—if the cap fits, put it squarely on! Whether this procedure affects your behaviour or not, it will certainly open your eyes.

Here then is the analysis. It will be given first in the

form of a nine-point summary; and afterwards each item of the summary will be discussed in detail.

Enhancement of the Ego through:

1. Family
2. Friends
3. Position
4. Possessions
5. Personal characteristics
6. Brains
7. Achievements
8. Character
9. Culture

1. *Enhancement of the Ego through Family.* This takes three main forms: frequent mention of ancestry, of relatives, and of children. In a social organization divided off into definite classes—as, for example, in Britain—to belong to an upper class is a decided advantage. The upper classes are, in the main, more educated, more cultured, more influential, and more highly respected. To claim connection with them, therefore, is to raise one's self above the common herd. Even in America, the same sort of thing is found—descent is proudly claimed from people who came over on the *Mayflower*, or from the pioneer inhabitants of the district. In Canada, many people trace their descent to the United Empire Loyalists, and are proud accordingly.

Now there is no particular reason why we should not rejoice in our exalted ancestry—but there is every reason why we should not use it to exalt ourselves. Those who brag the most about their forebears are usually people who amount to little or nothing in their own right. Such families have been likened to the potato-plant—the best part is underground!

Nearly everyone has at least one relative who affords en-

hancement of the ego—Uncle William, who has a fine position with the New York Symphony Orchestra; Cousin Charles, who speaks seven languages; or Grandfather Gibson, who was an intimate friend of King Edward the Seventh. This relative appears quite frequently in conversation, and tends to become more remarkable with every appearance.

Children are mainly a source of enhancement to their parents—though grandparents and other relatives claim their share. Every new baby is a creature of strange beauty and amazing genius. It is photographed enthusiastically, and the likenesses are shown to all who can be enticed to look at them. Its first lisping utterances are noted down, and repeated as examples of blinding intelligence or delightful humour.

The bragging process usually tapers off a bit as the child grows older, and becomes a very ordinary little mortal. But let him or let her have the smallest success in school or athletics, and the parental ego is sure to swell. "My Andrew," says his father, "shows great promise in physics. Einstein had better look to his laurels!" Or "My daughter Marguerite has a marvellous talent for acting. We shall certainly train her for stardom in Hollywood."

Even when children are grown up, and have turned out to be quite humdrum people after all, their parents talk about them with pride.

There is no great harm—and perhaps even a little good—in all this. Parents identify themselves with their children: they rejoice in their successes and sorrow over their failures. The real harm arises when they expect their children to do the things they themselves were unable to do—when the mother, for instance, who was baulked in her ambition to become a singer, insists that her daughter (a girl with a small voice and no real flair for music) shall be

prepared for the concert stage. There are many round pegs in square holes for no other reason than this.

2. *Enhancement of the Ego through Friends.* This is a much meaner form of enhancement than the one just described. It usually has far less justification. But one of the commonest things in the world is to hear people enlarging upon their intimacy with the great. Here is Bill Butler, who once saw Babe Ruth hit a home run, and who drags the fact into his conversation every time he can. Here is Mrs. Blenkinsop, who can never forget she once shook hands with a movie star. And here is Jim Sadler, who knows a man whose brother-in-law is a first-rate professional magician—and basks in this twice-reflected glory.

It is very absurd, but very human. If we cannot be great or publicly acclaimed or brilliantly clever ourselves—and few of us can!—then the next best thing is to link our importance up with people who are. It is a poor satisfaction, no doubt, but it relieves us of the need to make efforts on our own account.

3. *Enhancement of the Ego through Position.* This is one of the better enhancements—always providing the position is deserved. The boy who is made captain of the football team, and the girl who is elected president of the students' council, have real reason to rise a little in their self-esteem. In all likelihood, however, they will not find it necessary to brag.

The people who talk most about their positions are people who are not of sufficient calibre to fill them. Apart from their positions they are nobodies. So they everlastingly remind us of their amazing success, their great responsibilities, and their vast power. They protect themselves by assuming an air of dignity—and whistle to keep up their courage.

4. *Enhancement of the Ego through Possessions.* Here



we come face to face with the commonest enhancement of all. No one is so poor but he has something to show; and no one is so rich but he especially cherishes some part of his possessions. The small boy takes a rusty knife with two broken blades from his pocket, and tells you it has the finest cutting edge in North America. The rich man ushers you into his library and introduces you to his beautiful first editions.

Take the matter of clothing alone. The girl with a new dress is bitterly disappointed if it passes unnoticed and unpraised. The new university graduate puts on his hood and gown for the admiration of his family—and the benefit of the photographer. The workman feels strong and rugged in his rough clothes. The young officer takes great pride in the cut of his uniform. The bride rises to new heights of beauty in her grandmother's veil.

Consider such a commonplace thing as the family car.

It may be criticized now and again in private, but rarely in public. The honour of the family is concerned in its unusual performance! So we (the outsiders) are gravely told of its low gas-consumption, its wonderful reliability, its splendid lines, and its reserves of power.

Houses, gardens, radios, refrigerators, coats, cabbages, and cameras—all these things and a thousand more are used daily for enhancement of the ego. You have heard, no doubt, of 'keeping up with the Joneses'. Almost everyone does this in some degree. But when it is carried to excess, the result is disaster.

5. *Enhancing the Ego through Personal Characteristics.* How large a place do our looks and physical strength hold in our esteem? The question is easily answered. There must be very few people who do not regard themselves as excellent physical specimens. And within reason, they are justified. Downright ugliness is a rarity—and even when it occurs, the possessor probably thinks of himself as having a strong, rugged, and interesting face.

Small things loom large in the case of personal characteristics. We can pride ourselves on the shape of our nose, or on the fact that we can wiggle our ears. One girl will draw attention to her long, tapering fingers, and another to her delicate complexion. One will explain happily that her feet are a stock size, and another will extract prestige from the circumstance that her feet are very narrow and difficult to fit.

There seems to be nothing about us—perfection or imperfection—we cannot use. If a man were endowed with one eye in the middle of his forehead after the manner of the Cyclops, he would probably point to it with pride, and dilate on its advantages!

All of which is amusing, and not very harmful. A little vanity is probably good for us. At least it can carry us along

until we have something worth while to bolster our self-esteem.

6. *Enhancement of the Ego through Brains.* Practically everybody wants to be considered witty and wise; not many may truly be called so. As a result, most of us are greatly occupied with putting up a good front. We make a note of smart things other people have said, and seize the first opportunity to inject them into the conversation. We carefully learn the latest forms of expression—the clichés that pass from mouth to mouth with a vast appearance of wit—and use them with an air of bright originality. When matters beyond our knowledge are discussed, we take pains to look intelligent.

There are, of course, a thousand ways in which this form of enhancement operates. Some people quote the serious books they have read; others set up as experts in intellectual games; and still others merely go about with wise and solemn faces. Some people talk interminably about their academic distinctions or about the correspondence courses they have taken; others do cross-word puzzles at lightning speed, or claim to pass examinations 'without opening a book', or assure you they obtained a good working knowledge of Chinese in a couple of weeks.

Really able people need do nothing of this—their ability speaks for itself. Yet even the ablest men have been known to show off a little in the interest of the ego.

7. *Enhancement of the Ego through Achievements.* Of all reasons for pride, achievement is surely the best. Here, surely, we stand on firm ground. But the achievement of most human beings is very ordinary—so ordinary it fails to catch the public eye. As a result, the great majority of us have to bring it to other people's attention.

The trouble with this procedure—as with advertising in general—is that we are driven to exaggerate in order to

make an impression. We are driven by the need for ego-enhancement to trot out our small successes with a fanfare of trumpets and a beating of drums. And very often, as is but natural, we make ourselves ridiculous.

The worst cases are those where achievement is lacking—and has to be invented. This pitiable form of necessity is the mother of lies. Exaggeration is bad enough; but sheer invention is ten times worse, since it leads in the end, not to ego-enhancement, but to the severest kind of ego-deflation.

Illustrations are plentiful and you can supply them out of your experience. Here is one by way of a sample. In Dickens' *Pickwick Papers* there is a character called Winkle who claims to be a first-class sportsman. Since his companions are not familiar with sport in any form, they listen to him with respect and defer to his opinions on any matter concerning the out-of-doors. Winkle dresses like a sportsman, talks like one, and fairly basks in the enhancement of his ego. But a sad day arrives when he has to skate, and another sad day arrives when he has to shoot. Poor Winkle is mercilessly shown up, and his reputation for sportsmanship—to say nothing of truthfulness—is blasted for ever.

The moral of the story is easy to find. If you must use your achievements to enhance your ego, be careful those achievements—however small—have a foundation in fact.

8. *Enhancement of the Ego through Character.* Not even a cynic could find fault with this. But the process of enhancement should be limited to your own mind. If you are scrupulously honest, truthful, fair, and loyal, it should be enough that your own conscience approves. When you insist on publishing your goodness, and forcing it on the attention of others, you make a grave mistake.

Why so? For two chief reasons. First, because scoundrels are never done asserting the purity of their motives; and

second, because fine character needs no recommendation. The moment you mention your virtues, therefore, people will begin to suspect you. Say nothing about them—and let your actions speak on their behalf. This is one place where direct enhancement of the ego has the effect of a boomerang.

9. *Enhancement of the Ego through Culture.* Culture is a wide term, embracing both science and art. It is used here, however, in the limited sense of good taste in the social and artistic fields, because culture in this latter sense lends itself particularly well to ego-enhancement.

Standards of good taste are notoriously difficult to define. What is regarded as the height of courtesy in one country may be frowned upon as boorishness in another. One man's art may be another man's poison. In music, in painting, in literature, there are bitter differences of opinion even among the authorities.

Mark you, standards of good taste certainly exist. There is a definite idea of what constitutes well-bred behaviour in every country, including your own. The finest and most considerate people exemplify it.

In art, the great appraiser of worth is time. There are poems that have lived in the hearts of men for nearly three thousand years, paintings that have endured in glory since the far days of the Renaissance, music that has brought inspiration and delight to many generations. The true test of genius is its immortality, and these abiding works are the only sure standards of art we possess. This is not to say great art is not being produced in our own day and age. Such would be a foolish and narrow-minded statement. But it is to say there can be no certain judgment regarding the art of today, until time has appraised its worth.

Now you can see what a splendid situation this creates for ego-enhancement. Since there is no certainty about the

value of current poetry, painting, and music, almost anyone can set up as a critic. All he needs is a little information and a great deal of impudence. Having acquired these, together with a caustic tongue and an air of superiority, he can enhance his ego at everyone's expense. He can pretend, without fear of serious challenge, to have unusual insight and sensitiveness. After a while, unless he is caught in a series of obvious blunders, he will command the respectful admiration of his friends. He will even command his own.

* * * * *

Let us, in concluding the chapter, look for a moment at the other side. Probably the cap has fitted you a little too tightly, and something should be done to ease the pain! Note, therefore, the following points:

First, a certain amount of ego-enhancement is necessary to our happiness. We are not very important people after all, and we need to be reassured. It would be a hard world indeed, if we could not once in a while extract an admiring word from our fellows.

Second, it is an unfortunate fact that silent merit is rarely recognized. This is most clearly seen in the commercial field, where goods of even the finest quality cannot be sold without a certain amount of advertising. In the case of human beings, the same principle holds good—unless our excellencies are brought to people's attention, they go largely unnoticed.

Third, we cannot wholly depend on our relatives and associates to make our merits known. They have a much keener eye for our faults! So we are forced, often in violation of our modesty, to be our own publicity agents.

What then? A very definite course of action seems to be indicated. Genuine merit we must somehow have. That surely is essential, since with genuine merit to commend us,

we shall be under no temptation to enhance our ego with shams. Next, we must put forward our claims with discretion and reserve, always choosing the right moment and the right company.

To be quite frank, there is very little danger of under-advertising on anyone's part. The danger is chiefly the other way. So the most practical advice is probably this: Cut down your verbal ego-enhancement to about one-third of its present amount, and try as determinedly as you can to make it less enthusiastic and obvious.

CHAPTER 17

MOTIVE AND FRUSTRATION

THERE has been much talk of human motives throughout this book, and they are doubtless becoming familiar to you. The question to be discussed now is this: What happens when some fundamental motive is continually frustrated? Or to be more specific, what happens when a boy who loves athletics is ordered by his doctor to give up all participation in games, or when a girl is so plain she is unable to be attractive? You cannot claim to understand human nature until you know what to expect in such situations as these.

Frustration in some degree is the common lot of man. No one can say his needs are completely satisfied all the time. Indeed, no one can say his needs are completely satisfied even part of the time. You will remember, our needs are for ever changing—due to changes in the world and changes in ourselves. It would be an extraordinary thing—and a sad thing too—if every need were to be automatically satisfied as it arose.

Without unsatisfied needs, the human race would never accomplish anything. We should have no interests, no ambitions, no struggles, and no achievements. Every advance made in science and the arts has been the result of someone's restlessness and discontent.

The same applies in individual cases. You yourself continually look forward to being happier, wiser, better poised, more important, more useful, and a little wealthier than you are at the present time. In these and many other things you are mildly frustrated today. You are therefore eager

and vigorous, full of optimism, and determined to achieve the reasonable purposes you have in view. If it were otherwise, you would be little better than a cabbage. A moderate amount of frustration is a challenge and a spur.

Let us take a moment to recall the sequence of events when a frustration occurs. It is, of course, the ordinary process of adjustment—nothing more. First, there is frustration of a need. Second, there is tension in the great organs of the body. Third, there is varied activity to reduce the tension by satisfying the need. Fourth (with good luck!) there is the discovery of a successful variant. Fifth, the need is satisfied and the tension reduced.

Put briefly, the sequence is: Frustration—Tension—Varied Activity—Successful Variant—Satisfaction and Relaxation.

You will remember that thinking (careful examination of the situation, followed by the rehearsing and appraising of various modes of behaviour in the mind) is of great assistance in bringing the process of adjustment to a successful conclusion.

With this short review behind us, we are now in a position to analyse frustration itself. Here we shall meet with no difficulty, because it is well agreed that frustration is caused in three main ways:

1. By some obstacle in the environment.
2. By some limitation or defect in the individual.
3. By conflict of motives in the individual.

Each of these must be examined in detail. They are so common and explain so much of human behaviour, it would be impossible to exaggerate their importance. To understand them is a necessary part of your equipment. Spare no pains, therefore, to master them and to observe their outcomes.

1. *Frustration by some Obstacle in the Environment.* This is the most frequent, and the least serious of the three. It causes most of the minor annoyances of life. To illustrate: you want to write a letter and your fountain pen leaks all over your fingers; you are driving down town in a hurry and the lights are uniformly against you; you have arranged a picnic and the rain descends in a steady flood; you break a front tooth on the very eve of an important dance; you stumble and reel wildly about when you are trying to make a dignified entrance; you arrive home only to find you have mislaid your key; your radio goes dead at the moment you need it most.

An environmental obstacle can cause major annoyance too, and even grief—but this occurs much less frequently. Such a case was the snow that hastened Napoleon's retreat from Moscow, or the gale that battered the Spanish Armada. In ordinary life, cases might be like the following: there is someone you are longing to see, but you are many miles apart; you trip over a loose board and break your leg; you visit a friend's home and send a priceless vase crashing to the floor; an avalanche of snow and rock destroys a train; a high-tension wire snaps in a storm and causes the death of a passer-by.

This type of frustration,^a when we have the power to eliminate or reduce it, should be met with calm thought and appropriate action; when we have not the power, it should be met philosophically and with emotional control. It is all very well for a little child to weep or fly into a passion. The mature person does not rail uselessly against the inevitable. Indeed, it is the proof of his maturity to accept the inevitable with good grace, and to co-operate with it whenever possible.

2. *Frustration Due to Personal Limitation or Defect.* We come now to frustration of a very serious sort. When the



obstacle lies within ourselves, and not in the outer environment, its effect is infinitely more difficult to bear. Moreover, the problems that arise from such frustration are intensely personal, and frequently cannot be approached with a cool and thoughtful mind. As a result they are often solved badly—poor adjustments are made, and the victim either behaves in queer ways or he remains unsatisfied and miserable.

A few examples will make the condition clear. Personal limitations are of many kinds, of which the following are typical. A young man desires above all things to be a doctor, but in spite of his efforts he is quite unable to pass the necessary examinations. Another young man has a burning ambition to be a professional baseball player, but he is not quite good enough. A girl takes a long and arduous train-

ing to be a concert pianist, only to meet failure through insufficient talent.

On the side of personal defect—which has even worse outcomes in behaviour—consider these cases. An otherwise attractive girl is afflicted with some facial disfigurement. A boy whose whole mind runs to athletics is a cripple. A woman with social ambitions is quite unable to overcome the bad grammar she learned in childhood. A man who might succeed in business has a painful stutter that ruins every attempt at natural conversation.

We shall discuss the outcomes a little later on. It is sufficient at this point that you thoroughly grasp the differences between the three general causes of frustration.

3. *Frustration Due to Conflict of Motives.* This type of frustration can be either mild or serious. In its mild form it merely forces us to arrive at a decision—it compels us, that is to say, to carry out a process of thought in order to reach an adjustment. In its serious form, when both motives are so powerful that neither of them can be given up without resulting misery, it can tear the personality to pieces.

Let us look briefly at these two forms. The first is one of our most commonplace experiences. There is an essay you must write, but there is also an intensely interesting book at your elbow. How are you to behave? If you write the essay, you will be unable to share the adventures of Tony Mathers whom you left in the doubtful company of a cannibal chief. If you read the book, you will be taken severely to task by Mr. Adamson, your teacher, who demands that essays shall be handed in on time. You must make a decision, hard though that may be.

Again, you have two invitations for the same evening. One is to a social affair, where there will be dancing and cheerful company; the other is to a current events club you are eager to join. What will you do? The first appeals

strongly to your love of sociability, the second to your desire for maturity and respect. It is a difficult choice, but you will have to decide.

Serious conflict of motives is not a commonplace experience at all. Fortunately for us! Many people go through a whole lifetime without encountering it once. Here are some examples of its dreadful power to beat down and even crush the personality.

A child is brought up in a home where the parents are at everlasting odds with one another. Her father is an outdoor man, fond of gay company, a heavy drinker, down on all religion, bored with home life, and crude in his manners. Her mother is rather a recluse, a great reader of serious books, deeply religious, and highly refined. The little girl loves and admires them both. She tries to pattern her ideas and behaviour on each of them in turn—and miserably fails. She is for ever drawn in opposite directions; she can be sure of nothing; she can fashion no steady personality of her own.

A man works as a cashier and daily handles large sums of money. He is poorly paid and has a real struggle to support his family. His little son falls victim to a disease that can only be cured by taking him to a doctor in a distant city. The man knows a thousand dollars will save his son's life.

Now note his terrible dilemma. If he steals the money he will most certainly end in jail; if he does not steal it his son will die. How is this conflict of motives to be resolved? Whatever he does, he will be wholly miserable, and there is a grave likelihood his personality will be shattered.

THE OUTCOMES OF FRUSTRATION

Since we have already discussed the value of ordinary frustration in human life, there is no need to reopen the

discussion here. Suffice it to say that mild frustration is necessary to our development and progress. The question to be answered now is this: What kinds of behaviour result when frustration is continuous and intense?

Let us first of all lay aside frustration due to obstacles in the environment. Our ability to bear them is in proportion to our maturity. They must be met with resolution and fortitude. The wise man is one who can accommodate himself to them and even use them as means to his better adjustment in the end.

Frustration Due to Personal Limitations or Defect. Frustration due to personal limitation and defect is a very different matter, and its outcomes call for close examination. If you wish to gain a practical insight into human nature, this is an excellent place to make your best effort.

We all have some personal limitations and defects—even the luckiest of us. Real harm occurs only under one condition: *when the limitation or defect is brought bitterly to our attention.* This is the great point. We take our weaknesses for granted and think little of them, until they are somehow rubbed painfully in. Then they rankle, and change our whole outlook.

You will see at once we have a clean-cut plan of action in dealing with people to whom nature has been unkind. The defect, whatever it is, must be taken as a matter of course. It must neither be dragged forward into prominence nor painfully ignored. Our plain business as decent human beings is to protect the feelings of our fellows.

But this, alas, does not always happen, and the victim of limitation or defect becomes bitterly aware of his misfortune. The iron enters into his soul. He is haunted by a sense of failure and unworthiness that has a harmful effect on everything he does. He acquires *the inferiority attitude*, and his personality is thereby distorted.

The outcomes of Inferiority Attitude are of two main kinds: Defence, and Withdrawal. Each of these will have to be considered in turn.

1. *Defence*. This is an effort to hide the sense of inferiority behind a curtain of confidence and aggressiveness. The curtain is flimsy enough in most cases, but it has an amazingly stout appearance. The wounded creature who lives behind it is not visible at all. Presented on the curtain in his place is a boastful, pushful, over-confident individual who can hardly be borne.

You must have met many people of this sort. They are usually condemned out of hand as arrogant and egoistic. Only a few of us have wisdom enough to look behind the curtain. Here, for your enlightenment, are some of the signs by which Defence can be recognized:

- (a) The person cannot bear any sort of criticism.
- (b) He is extremely open to flattery.
- (c) He often thinks people are discussing him.
- (d) He is a poor sportsman, and avoids fair competition.
- (e) He is much given to running others down.
- (f) He is aggressive, boastful, and sometimes given to lies.

There are several ways in which Defence operates in the matter of behaviour. These are Compensation, Identification, Projection, and Rationalizing. You will see that each of them fits into the pattern outlined above.

Compensation is hiding a defect by playing up some other characteristic or ability. We all do this, of course, but in Defence the played-up characteristic or ability is made absurdly prominent—it is forced down other people's throats. For example, a boy too awkward for athletics may become a savage bully; or he may turn with exaggerated enthusiasm to saxophone playing; or he may go in with one-sided devotion for academic study. In each case he *over-values* the means by which he compensates.

Identification is linking up one's importance with that of someone or something else. We noted this over and over again in the chapter on ego-enhancement. In Defence, however, the ordinary process is grossly overdone. The individual brags insufferably about his family, his friends, his possessions, and the organizations of which he is a member. Sensing his own inferiority, he attaches himself with all his might to the people and things he believes to have prestige.

Projection is seeing our own weaknesses in other people, and condemning them with unnecessary heat. By such vigorous condemnation, we convince ourselves the weaknesses are not ours at all. It is an odd quirk of human nature—and very enlightening to the keen observer. When a man says, "If there is one thing in this world I abominate and despise—if there is one thing that disgraces a player and makes him disgusting and contemptible—it is cheating at golf!" he is throwing a deadly light on his own temptations. On the whole, it would be well not to play golf with him.

Rationalizing is *making something seem reasonable that is not really so*. It is the most common failing in human nature. It is bad enough in all of us, but it is ten times worse in Defence. Here the individual, because of his carefully suppressed sense of inferiority, simply dare not admit himself to be in the wrong. No matter how he blunders, he has a ready excuse; no matter how badly he is outplayed, he has a prompt alibi. Rationalizing is the main part of the curtain behind which he hides his cowering ego, and he clings to it with the stubbornness of desperation.

2. *Withdrawal*. The second main way in which the Inferiority Attitude operates is by causing the unhappy individual to draw into himself. In this way his limitation or defect is concealed. If he does not try, he cannot fail—so

he goes off into a quiet world of his own, where there is no competition and no need to keep up a front for society.

The symptoms of Withdrawal are so obvious, there is little necessity to list them—but perhaps a list will bring them more sharply to your mind:

- (a) Tendency to remain much alone.
- (b) Preference for solitary amusements—reading, making collections, etc.
- (c) Avoidance of all social prominence.
- (d) Frequent changes of colour (ready embarrassment).
- (e) Tendency, if a child, to play with younger children; if grown up, to associate with mental or social inferiors.
- (f) An inordinate amount of day-dreaming.

These people are not social problems in the sense that users of Defence can be seen to be so. They interfere with nobody, compete with nobody, harm nobody. They are so quiet and self-effacing, they are often thought of as modest, courteous people who are at peace with the world. We may even wish there were more people like them.

Now the hard truth is just this. Withdrawal is a much more dangerous condition than Defence, and can lead to an outcome vastly more serious. It is, in fact, one of the most dangerous conditions into which a person—and especially a young person—can get.

What can we do about Defence and Withdrawal? The best thing we can do is to prevent the Inferiority Attitude from arising. Here, as in most places, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. If everyone were to take the limitations and defects of others in the same way we take the vagaries of the weather, there would soon be no problem.

The cure for both these conditions is somehow to remove the cause of the Inferiority Attitude. No easy matter! In the case of Defence, the individual must be built up over

a long period, through a series of genuine if small successes. His real abilities—of which almost everybody has some—must be so developed that he will have no further need to brag of sham ones. He must exchange shadow for substance, and enhance his ego by real instead of imaginary achievement.

In the case of Withdrawal, the cure is much harder to bring about; but here also, the cause of Inferiority Attitude must be found and eliminated. Many cases of Withdrawal are due to lack of social opportunity—to having been brought up in a remote place, to having been kept apart from other children, to having had a great deal of illness. Each case must be studied by itself. The interests of the person must be used to bring him gradually into contact with small groups of his fellows. You will remember our examination of introversion. The person who is a victim of Withdrawal is extremely introverted, and can be treated according to the same principles.

Frustration Due to Conflict of Motives. We now come to the outcomes of frustration due to serious conflict of motives, and with this discussion we shall have covered the subject. When such a conflict persists for a long time, when the individual can find no solution to his problem, one of two very distressing results may occur. Either he may suffer a complete breakdown of personality, or he may be exhausted by perpetual tension.

This is not the place for a full analysis of these two possible outcomes, since they are within the field of abnormal psychology. A brief description, however, will give you an idea of their nature and will serve as an introduction to the more detailed reading you may some day wish to do.

First, breakdown of the personality (properly called Hysteria, and known as Shell-shock when it occurs among soldiers) seems to be due to the blocking off of certain parts

of the nervous structure from the brain. These parts are 'dissociated', and are no longer within the individual's control. Some of his sense organs are unable to send messages to his brain, with the result that he may be blind, deaf, or quite without feeling in certain areas of his body. Or some of his muscles are disconnected from his brain, and he is partially paralysed. Cure usually follows removal of the original conflict of motives.

Second, exhaustion from perpetual tension (properly called Neurasthenia, and by no means an uncommon complaint) is much easier to understand. Perpetual tension uses up the individual's supply of energy, stops him from sleeping properly, and disturbs his digestion. He becomes worn out and thin. He also becomes morbid and dreadfully irritable. In this case also, cure is brought about by removal of the original conflict. A lesser degree of persistent tension, known to you as worry, has similar—though much more bearable—effects, and is cured in the same way.

To sum up, frustration is an excellent thing in reasonable doses. It touches off the process of adjustment, and makes us active in mind and body. Frustration that produces an Inferiority Attitude, however, is an evil to be avoided both in ourselves and others—Defence and Withdrawal are miserable forms of adjustment. Frustration so severe and persistent that it produces Hysteria or Neurasthenia is the greatest evil of all. In this case, adjustment in the true sense simply does not occur.

CHAPTER 18

THE ART OF SPEECH

SPEECH is perhaps the greatest of the arts. At least it is the most universal. By speech we are distinguished from all other forms of life. Doubtless all creatures communicate with each other in some fashion, but it has remained for man to develop his means of communication into a comprehensive, exquisitely flexible, and moving instrument. Using it, he can convey every shade of meaning, every nuance of emotion.

Speech is also the most greatly abused of the arts. Many thousands of people in every country have no care for its correctness and no ear for its beauty. Their language is poverty-stricken, inexact, slovenly, and base. They perpetually condemn themselves out of their own mouths; for there is nothing that more obviously marks off the cultured man from the ignorant or boorish man than the level of his everyday speech. If you would be respected, therefore, you must give careful attention to your diction.

Four things stand out: choice of words; construction of sentences; pronunciation; and enunciation. Let us look at each of these in turn.

1. Your choice of words is limited by your vocabulary—you can make payment only with the coins in your pocket. You must extend your vocabulary to cover all your needs of expression. There may be songs without words, but there is certainly no intelligible language without them. Remember that choice is always limited by the number of alterna-

tives, that you must have command of far more words than those you decide to use on any particular occasion.

How is the vocabulary extended? By no short-cut, certainly. Here are some of the chief ways in which it can be done:

- (a) By wide reading.
- (b) By associating with educated people.
- (c) By looking up every new word in the dictionary.
- (d) By familiarizing yourself with shades of meaning.
- (e) By using your vocabulary as you acquire it.

2. Your construction of grammatical and graceful sentences depends mainly on what you hear and read. The study of grammar is in itself far less helpful than most people imagine. This is not to say grammar is useless—far from it. But it is to say it must be powerfully reinforced by other means. Many people are capable of analysing sentences with great correctness, and yet of using dreadfully constructed sentences in their ordinary speech.

What then? As in the case of vocabulary, a few rules may help to give direction to your efforts:

- (a) Read for style as well as content—be awake not only to what is written, but to how it is written.
- (b) Listen to the constructions used by people whose English you admire. Cultivate the society of such people.
- (c) Keep conscious control of your language, both written and oral, until accurate and graceful constructions become habitual.
- (d) Use grammar, wherever necessary, as a means of checking your correctness.

3. Your pronunciation depends on the speech to which you are accustomed. As you know, it varies greatly in different countries, and even in different parts of the same

country. Probably your best plan is to pattern your pronunciation on that of the most cultured people in your own circle of acquaintance. In cases of doubt, a standard dictionary is your surest guide.

One thing to avoid like a plague is artificiality. Nothing is more distressing than this to the hearer, because it is very often a piece of arrant snobbery. Not only so, it is rarely to be depended upon: the man with an artificial accent is apt to pronounce some words one way and some the other, thus ending with a sort of speech that is neither fish, flesh, nor good red herring. Moreover, when a man's accent is artificial, we are inclined to doubt his sincerity.

4. Your enunciation is another matter, and depends on no one but yourself. It has to do with opening your mouth and using your vocal equipment in such a way as to produce clear, distinct, and intelligible sounds. Not to do this is simply to be lazy and discourteous.

A good deal was said about language in the chapter on meaning, but two of the points touched upon there are worthy of fuller consideration. They are verbalizing, and the use of vague but impressive terms. If these two evils could be done away with, there would be an immediate improvement in the human mind.

VERBALIZING

Verbalizing (the use of words without a proper understanding of their meaning) serves several base purposes. It is a cloak—and by no means a safe one—for ignorance; it is an ego-enhancement of the sham variety; and it is a short-cut to a superficial sort of success.

People who use verbalizing as a cloak for ignorance or as an enhancement of the ego, do so at their own risk. Their words have an unpleasant way of snapping back in their faces, and of revealing the very weakness they are trying to

hide. This of course is especially true of big words. You must often have smiled with mingled sadness and disgust, when some friend of yours used a big word in the wrong place and altogether out of its meaning. There is an amusing character in one of Sheridan's plays—Mrs. Malaprop—who drives the audience into gales of laughter with this kind of absurdity.

Verbalism as a short-cut to superficial success puts a heavy emphasis on memory, and in the long run makes its user as ridiculous as Mrs. Malaprop. Mention has already been made of it as a way to scrape through examinations. It appears, however, on many other occasions in life—particularly among people who memorize their speeches.

Now it is not a crime to memorize a speech. It is just one of the things a sensible person tries not to do. There may be some excuse for it in the first speech one has to make, but very little. Yet there are those who dare not face an audience with any other sort of preparation, and for them there is this golden rule to apply: Use no words that are unfamiliar; keep within the limits of your ordinary vocabulary. There is no more distressing thing than to hear a man start off with over-elegant words and constructions, and then, through lapse of memory, fall back into commonplace and halting language.

FOG WORDS

The use of vague but impressive terms is a far worse evil than verbalizing. To verbalize is a sin against one's self, but to speak in foggy, high-sounding words is a sin against other people. And the latter sin is the less pardonable of the two.

Why is such a form of expression used? For any or all of the following reasons: to conceal the truth; to mystify and delude the hearer; to build up the prestige of the speaker.

There may be occasions when the truth should be concealed—as, for example, when a girl struck down by a mortal disease asks if she is going to die—but these are not numerous. Concealment of the truth in the genuine interest of someone else may under certain conditions be defensible, but concealment of it in our own interest is beyond the pale of decent behaviour. When, therefore, a man who is asked a plain and proper question, takes refuge in foggy, high-sounding words, he is guilty of an offence against the truth. To put it bluntly: he is lying.

The use of such words to mystify or delude the hearer is an offence of much the same sort. In this case, however, the aim is rather to distort the truth than to hide it. It is an effort on the part of the speaker to plant erroneous ideas in the hearer's mind—to falsify his mental content and thus impair his judgment. (You will recall the discussion of mental development.) The speaker always has an axe to grind. He wants to reach or remain in a position of influence; or he has designs on the hearer's pocket; or he is simply a fanatic who is determined that other people shall think as he does.

There seems to be an evil magic in the very sound of impressive words. What we do not understand strikes us as deeply profound or immensely exalted. We stand in awe of so much wisdom and nobility of thought. We fail to remember that all the truest and finest things in the world have been said in simple language.

So we are fair game for the spell-binder and the mystery-merchant and the fanatic—to say nothing of the high-pressure salesman! And we shall continue to be fair game until we insist on ideas being conveyed to us in simple and intelligible terms. For there is nothing we are capable of understanding that cannot be so conveyed.

In the last place, vague and impressive words are used to

build up the prestige of the speaker. They are intended to leave you with a deep sense of his wisdom and superiority—and of your own comparative ignorance and unworthiness. Many a commonplace and even shoddy man has established himself in the public mind as a great thinker or a great idealist by no other means than his fluent use of unintelligible language. He depends on our lack of critical power, beats us down with his heavy artillery, and enhances his precious ego.

Let us look, however, at some examples of the method, since there is nothing better than judging for yourself. The examples are not exact quotations—for reasons that are obvious! But they are typical of much of the writing that passes for literary English.

The first is taken from an essay on art, and goes substantially as follows:

“Significant art is characterized by the plastic interpenetration of matter and the complete suffusion of creative substance. Untouched by these enrichments of genius, no art can endure. It is the business of the artist to endue his spirit with the sensitivity of universals, to bathe his inspiration in the eternal springs of esoteric effulgence. His is the epoptic vision, and through the pervasiveness of cosmic emanations he can etherialize the crude realism of time and space.”

This, you must admit, has a very wonderful sound. Its author, no doubt, had “bathed his inspiration in the eternal springs of esoteric effulgence”. But what does it mean? No one will ever know!

The second example has to do with one of the numerous ologies that go under the name of ‘Mystic Science’.

“If he is to enter the House of Harmony, the neophyte must first tune his whole being to the vibrations of the Cosmic Masters. But the way is long and arduous. Many

years must pass, as he progresses through the Seven Planes of Existence to the Gateway of Perfection. He must devote himself whole-heartedly to Transcendental Study, and follow unweariedly the precepts of Radiated Guidance."

This, too, is a remarkable passage. The words are all in the dictionary, and the grammar is correct—but what of the meaning? The meaning is to be found in the next paragraph, which states that the 'neophyte' can obtain the necessary 'radiated guidance' by paying twenty-five dollars for a course of instruction.

The third and last example is based on an advertisement for a face-cream.

“Would you have a cheek as sweetly bewitching as that of Sappho and as softly velvet as that of Sheba? Would you array yourself in the beauty of the dawn and the lambent glow of the sunset? Charm, loveliness, elegance—these are yours for the taking! A single jar of Damask Bloom will bring you your heart's desire.”

Words, words, shining and enchanting words! By virtue of a “single jar of Damask Bloom” (whose main constituent is probably hog-grease), the lady will “array herself in the beauty of the dawn and the lambent glow of the sunset” And all for fifty cents.

CONVERSATION

Let us turn now to another aspect of speech, namely, conversation. Here we come to a very practical matter, for conversation is something in which everyone must take part. There are many human activities we can avoid, but this is not one of them.

What, first of all, are the bases of successful conversation? They are five in number and can be set down as follows:

1. The possession of interesting ideas.
2. Fluency and ease in expressing them.



3. A touch of drama and a sense of humour.
4. Ability to listen to others, and to stimulate their talk.
5. A courteous manner and a well-modulated voice.

Since everybody wishes to be a reasonably good conversationalist, it will be well to examine these five points in some detail. It may be said at the outset that all five can readily be acquired by anyone who seriously wishes to do so.

1. *Possession of Interesting Ideas.* Perhaps the best way to discuss this is to consider the case of Albert Selwyn, an intelligent enough young man who was painfully at a loss in a group of chatting people. He never seemed to have a thing to say; and when he did struggle to make a few remarks, all he got was brief and merely courteous attention.

The day came at last when Albert went in desperation to a middle-aged friend for advice. His friend cross-examined him to some extent about his interests, and then

addressed him in these words: "I'll tell you what it is, Albert—you just don't know enough. No, don't argue with me right off! I don't mean you're not educated. Not at all. What I mean is you don't know enough about the things that interest those young acquaintances of yours. I'll give you a practical suggestion. Listen in on their conversation for a couple of weeks more, and make a list of the topics they discuss. Then take your list—certain kinds of sport, movies, magazines, books, politics, whatever the topics turn out to be—and put in some solid study on those things in your spare time. The upshot will be you'll be able to say something worth while in every conversation. You may even come to be the most interesting talker in the crowd."

2. *Fluency and Ease.* There is no simple and straightforward way to acquire these, but here are a few pointers that may help matters along. The greatest thing of all is to have something of genuine interest to say—then the eager attention of others in the group will greatly increase your confidence. Practice, too, is tremendously important, and can be done in two ways. Both are well worth noting—and using.

One of them is to rehearse imaginary conversations in your mind. If you are like the rest of mankind, you probably talk a good deal to yourself when you are alone. This talk can be turned to excellent account! Keep your eyes and ears open, and whenever anything striking or odd comes within your observation, think out the problem of how you could describe it interestingly to someone else. Choose the most telling features of the incident; dramatize it in your mind; select the best words and phrases in which to dress it up; go over it critically again and again.

The other way to practise is just to join in conversation often, to be a good listener as well as an interesting talker, and to force yourself always to be courteous.

3. *Drama and Humour.* These are the things that make your conversation lively and sparkling. Do not be afraid to act a little—brighten up your remarks with changes of facial expression, with occasional pantomime and gestures, and with variations in your voice. When you describe an incident that has to do with people, give it sometimes in the form of a dialogue. In brief, put warmth and vitality into your talk.

Humour is something else again, and it will be discussed later in a chapter by itself. All that need be said here is that humour is the spice of conversation. Without it, your talk is apt to be a little flat and commonplace. Conversation is like throwing a ball from one person to another. The humorous man is not content with simple tossing—he imparts his own personal spin to the ball. And this makes the ball a good deal livelier and more entertaining to catch.

4. *Listening, and Stimulation of Others.* The art of listening is really a very simple art. It calls for three things: an eager look, an attentive ear, and a well-reined tongue. Anyone with a grain of sense can acquire it. The third thing is the hardest to learn, not because there is any mystery about it, but because on most occasions we are so immensely anxious to report our own experiences. We are apt to forget that conversation is throwing the ball to someone else—not hurling it high in the air, and then catching it with remarkable agility ourselves.

Stimulating the talk of other people is a much more difficult art than intelligent listening. Usually it is only acquired after long practice. It consists in understanding exactly what the other person is anxious to say, and putting in the remarks that will enable him to say it. It consists in leading the conversation round to his interests and activities, and offering him a helping hand whenever he flags or becomes self-conscious. Great insight, tact, and restraint are re-

quired. To return to the simile of the ball: you must keep throwing it to him—gently at first, but with increasing spin—until he catches it adroitly, and throws it back with confidence.

One small point must be added here. You will meet quite a number of people who need no stimulation at all. Bores, we call them. In these cases, your tact and restraint will only encourage them to be more talkative and tedious than ever. Some of them you will have to endure as patiently as you can; but for the rest, the best plan is to avoid them.

5. *Courtesy and a Well-Modulated Voice.* Regarding courtesy there is no argument. As a skilful conversationist, you must remember your manners, keep away from personal remarks, put a guard upon your temper, and do no more than your fair share of the talking. All these things you know very well already, and it only remains to put them into practice.

Your voice—because you never hear it as it really is—calls for serious consideration. It should be loud enough to be distinctly heard, and low enough to be pleasing. This much you can manage for yourself. But regarding its quality, you must rely upon the judgment and advice of others. It may be too high, or too harsh, or too lifeless. If so, do not give up in despair, and say it is the voice nature has given you. Proper voice-production can be learned, and for the sake of other people—to say nothing of your own—you should devote a few hours to learning it.

We have now examined the art of speech from two angles: sheer expression of ideas, and conversation. There are several other angles from which it can be regarded, such as writing, addressing a face-to-face audience, and speaking over the radio. Of these, only writing falls within the scope of this book. Platform-speaking and radio-speaking are not common to the experience of many people, and may be re-

regarded as specialized arts. Moreover, there is no lack of excellent books that deal with them in thoroughly detailed fashion.

WRITING

No attempt will be made here to analyse the art of writing. It will be sufficient to say that everything said about oral expression applies also to written expression. To quote an old authority, you must write with 'clearness, brevity, and point'. You must have something worth while you want to say; and you must say it in such a manner as to convey clean-cut ideas, without needless words, and with a strong appeal to the interest of the reader.

No one can tell you how to develop a personal style—yet this is something every great writer has somehow developed. It is the stamp of your own personality, the mark of your own character. Without it, you are just another literary mediocrity—and the world is full of these already.

Here, at least, is a word of advice. If you wish to be a writer, read widely among the best authors, both classical and modern. Read with keen observation of each individual style. You may even, as an exercise, try your own hand at each individual style that appeals to you. In due time, if you have the necessary talent and write industriously, a style of your own will begin to emerge. Then, and not till then, can you regard yourself as a writer.

CHAPTER 19

HUMOUR

THE sense of humour is an attitude of mind; and being a habit, it can be acquired. This is contrary to a great deal of opinion, but general opinion is by no means always right. The theory that a person is born either humorous or otherwise is quite out of line with everything we know about mental development. If, therefore, your humour has been called in question, take heart. By acquiring a new attitude toward people and their doings, you may be as humorous as anyone else.

Next to cheerfulness, humour is probably the most popular trait. It is the simplest form of amusement we have, since it costs nothing and affords great pleasure. And although it is odd to talk about humour in a serious way, a little while devoted to its consideration will not be wasted. In fact, it may be very well spent.

What then is humour? So far as we can judge in the case of a thing so elusive, it has to do with perceiving the incongruities that constantly occur in man's behaviour and handiwork. It has to do with perceiving things that are out of harmony with the general and expected pattern of man's life.

Let us note a few of these things to make the point clear. A dignified man puts his foot on a child's slide, and sits suddenly down with his hat over one eye and a look of shocked surprise on his face. Why do we laugh? Because the situation is incongruous, because such an undignified

occurrence is out of harmony with that man's appearance and habits of life.

A friend of ours is served with a plateful of curry for the first time. He takes a mouthful, and the most comical look of anguish comes over his face. Why is it comical? Because it is so out of keeping with the confident and satisfied expression he usually wears when he is eating. The look is incongruous to the situation. If our friend were ill in bed, the same look would not be comical at all.

An artist paints a picture in which the grass is pink and the cattle are green. Artists have been known to do such things. We look at the picture and chuckle heartily. Why? Simply because the colour-scheme is wholly foreign to our experience.

We attend a movie showing King Henry the Eighth eating roasted chicken in the fashion of *his* time, and we laugh



with all our might. For what reason? Because his manners are dreadfully out of harmony with those of *our* time.

We meet a foreigner, who bows from the waist and greets us in a stilted and courtly manner. It is all we can do to repress a smile. Why so? Because *our* customs are altogether different; because his behaviour is so utterly at variance with that of all the men we know.

It has been suggested that we laugh at 'the minor mishaps of life'—and this is true. But it does not cover the whole ground. We laugh at everything that is out of keeping with the patterns of life to which we are accustomed, whether it is someone's minor mishap or not. We laugh at incongruities in art, in clothing, in manners, in literature, in sport, and even in thought.

Note this important point, however: We do not laugh at major mishaps. If a man who fell on the slide had broken his leg, we should not be thinking about his injured dignity—we should be thinking about his helplessness and pain. We should not laugh, but sympathize.

WIT AND HUMOUR

Having now analysed the basis of humour, let us turn to the ways in which it is distinguished from wit. Wit is set off in exactly the same ways, but with a marked difference in the attitude of mind with which incongruities are regarded. It is also less easily turned to sympathy. The differences between the witty attitude and the humorous attitude may be set down as follows:

The witty man is superior and a little cruel. He looks down from a great height at the mishaps and shortcomings of *other people*. His remarks are neatly—often brilliantly—expressed, and each one of them carries a sting.

The humorous man has no notion of superiority, and is genuinely sympathetic. He makes gentle fun not only of

other people's mishaps and shortcomings, but also of *his own*. The things he says are quite unpretentious observations—marked, however, by the insight and wisdom of his personality—and they bring pain to no one.

Illustrations of wit are easy to find, because each of them comes to a sharp and polished point. Here are one or two for your consideration.

Oscar Wilde, the poet and playwright, was once approached by one of those pushing men who make the lives of celebrities miserable. "Mr. Wilde," said the man, seizing his hand and shaking it vigorously, "you remember me, of course. My name is Smith." Wilde looked at him for a moment and then blandly replied, "Oddly enough, I don't. Your name is familiar, but I can't seem to recall your face."

Superiority, neat phrasing, sting—they are all there. And who is to say the rebuke was not deserved?

Alexander Pope, so the story goes, was once sitting in the London coffee-house where his word was law. You will remember, Pope was a famous poet, but a man embittered by the fact that his body was small, feeble, and greatly bent.

Two men over in a corner were vainly trying to translate a piece of Latin. Do what they would, they could make neither head nor tail of it, and Pope sat huddled forward in his place thoroughly enjoying their discomfiture.

At this point a young man entered the coffee-house, and soon over-hearing the talk, went over and offered his services in translating the Latin. He was warmly welcomed, and after a moment's thought said, "There's an error in printing—an interrogation mark has been omitted. If you put it in, you'll have no more trouble."

Pope was greatly annoyed; he felt his presence had been overlooked and his authority slighted. "Young man," he asked in a voice full of sarcasm, "and what may an interrogation mark be?"

The young man turned to him sharply. "Mr. Pope," he replied, "It's a little crooked thing that asks questions."

This is wit at its brightest and cruelest. Possibly Pope deserved what he got, but most of us would crush down the reply before it reached our lips.

Illustrations of humour are much more difficult to find, for the simple reason that it is rarely compressed into a neat and pointed phrase. It is often haltingly spoken, and accompanied by a rueful though twinkling look. The ruefulness comes of the humorous man's inclusion of his own little failings among those against which his sally is directed. The twinkle comes of his having seized upon some comical but wholly human incongruity. In laughing at others, he also laughs at himself.

A speaker, who in the course of a long and laboured address, found he was boring his audience, stopped and said this: "I'm not doing any too well, I know. So if you take out your watch once in a while and look at it doubtfully, I can't say a word. But if you shake it and hold it to your ear, then I feel you are carrying things just a mite too far."

Once when Dr. Stephen Leacock, the Canadian humorist, stepped from the train at Montreal, the fact was announced by a local newspaper in these words: "Professor Leacock arrived from Toronto this morning, very informally clad." When Leacock read this, his comment was: "Informally nothing! Those were my best things."

A certain teacher, who shall be nameless, noticed one of his students busily copying a sheet of music while he was endeavouring to explain some complicated point in grammar. He walked very quietly over to her desk, and said, "Well, well, Miss Smith—many things have been done with my lessons, but you are the first student who ever set one of them to music."

You may have gathered from all these illustrations that

wit is to be condemned and humour encouraged. This, of course, would be a tremendous over-statement of the case. Certainly, humour is to be encouraged, but so also are many forms of wit. When wit is clever, neatly phrased, and *not cruel*, it is the source of genuine entertainment. Gentle irony, mild sarcasm, even puns and 'wise-cracks', do much to make conversation interesting and lively. Only when the irony is biting, the sarcasm savage, and the 'wise-cracks' offensive, are we justified in crying out against them. In these cases—especially where the victim is helpless to defend himself—they are an outrage to decent behaviour.

Mention has been made of the pun—probably the humblest expression of wit or humour. Very little is ever said on behalf of the pun, yet puns can sometimes fairly sparkle with brilliancy. Here is one that did: Many years ago in England there was a great painter called Solomon who (at the time the pun was made) had not been elected to membership of the Royal Academy, and in consequence was unable to write the letters R.A. after his name. The Royal Academicians of that day were getting old, their ideas about art were perhaps a little out of date, and they themselves were producing few pictures of any importance. Furthermore, they did not approve of Solomon's 'modern' work, and had so far shown their disapproval by failing to elect him.

A strong supporter of Solomon, writing about art and artists, made this comment—directly quoted from the Bible—on the Academicians: "They toil not, neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not R.A.'d like one of these."

ACQUIRING THE HUMOROUS ATTITUDE

It was said at the beginning of the chapter that the humorous attitude can be acquired, and to this in closing

we return. How, then, is the sense of humour developed? No sure method can be laid down, but a few suggestions can be offered.

First, you must by keen observation learn to see clearly into the workings of human nature, including your own. Second, you must cultivate the habit of seeing the incongruities in human behaviour, including your own. Third, you must learn to be kindly, sympathetic, and tolerant. Fourth, you must develop your appreciation of humour by listening for it in the talk and looking for it in the writings of others. And lastly, you must try now and again to be humorous yourself.

If one more word of advice may be added after 'lastly', it is this: Put on no airs, content yourself with simple expressions, give pain to nobody.

CHAPTER 20

PERSONAL CULTURE

THERE is a notion abroad—and a very popular notion it is—that culture consists only in good manners and appreciation of the fine arts. It includes these, of course, but it is by no means limited to them. Culture in the true sense embraces everything that makes human life more comfortable, more enlightened, and more gracious. It embraces science, technology, philosophy, and institutions, as well as art. It is concerned not only with symphonies and oil-paintings, but also with synthetic rubber, and aeroplanes, and drainage systems. It has to do not only with our manners and speech, but also with our ways of treating delinquents, and foreigners, and the aged poor. In a word, culture covers the whole of life.

Your personal culture, therefore, depends on your knowledge, your skills, your conduct, and your tastes. If you are undeveloped in any one of the four, your culture is by that much the poorer. To be fully cultured, you must have a sound scientific background, you must be able to do things with your hands, you must act and speak according to the best standards of your society, and you must derive genuine pleasure from literature, art, and music. No small requirement! you exclaim—but it is the minimum for all that.

Culture is as old as man: it has been present in some form and some degree in every age. The cave-man fashioned his crude weapons and tools, was wise in the lore of hunting savage beasts and protecting his family, and made his etched drawings on the walls of his cave. No doubt he had his



rules of conduct too—perhaps also a simple sort of music and dance. The four aspects of culture—knowledge, skill, social conduct, and esthetic appreciation—were all represented in his life.

It has been thus in every age and in every inhabited part of the world. Always man has built up a culture in terms of the conditions under which he lived—his geographical and climatic environment and its resources, his relationship with other tribes or countries. But steadily down through the ages, in spite of occasional set-backs, the great body of human culture has grown and its benefits have been more widely distributed over the earth. Today, the facts and principles of science are available to every civilized people; the techniques of work and play are at the service of all who wish to learn them; enlightened rules of society are nowhere a secret; music, art, and even literature are the common

possession of mankind and can everywhere be enjoyed. In brief, the great treasury of human culture is today at the disposal of every civilized race.

But it is personal culture with which we are here concerned. The question to be answered is this: How can you, as an individual, attain it? By what process of development can you become and remain a cultured person?

A general answer is not particularly hard to find. All we have to do is proceed in a logical way, and consider each of the four aspects of culture in turn.

1. *Knowledge*. This is the chief outcome of school and university work. It is not, however, as you very well know, merely a matter of memorizing certain facts and principles. Such memorization is necessary, but it must be accompanied by insight and understanding. The great thing is to be able to use the facts and principles to explain events and to meet new situations. Your knowledge must be a source of enlightenment, not a means of passing examinations or of showing off to other people. It must enable you to grasp, without any great difficulty, the simple scientific ideas that underlie industrial machines and processes, the common techniques of business, the broad principles of government and economics, and the ordinary problems of human behaviour. If it is to be called knowledge, it should work for you. And some day, very gradually, it will knit together into your philosophy; it will come to form a pattern, and will give you a larger view of man and his world.

2. *Skills*. These are fundamental to efficient work, to all degrees of expertness in sport, and to capability in the every-day routines of life. They are needed by the factory operative, the sales clerk, the physician, the basket-ball player, the ski-jumper, the car-driver, and even the dishwasher. They must be acquired for such commonplace activities as dressing, and eating, and carrying parcels. No

one is fully cultured who is clumsy and awkward in the use of his body—and especially of his hands. The most learned man is to that extent lacking in culture, if he cannot put up a shelf in the kitchen or change a washer in the bathroom tap.

3. *Social Behaviour.* In this field, the traits to be developed are cheerfulness, courtesy, tact, honour, adequate speech, conversational ability, humour, and poise. There would be no point in discussing these traits in detail here. In order to develop them, you must resolutely practise them day by day. Nothing less will do. Culture demands good manners certainly, but it also demands effectiveness and dependability in all the give-and-take of social life. The cultured man is a socially competent man.

4. *Artistic Appreciation.* There is so great a diversity of taste in the field of the arts, it is almost impossible to find any universally accepted standards. As has been said in an earlier chapter, the great appraiser of art is time. Those things are good that have brought pleasure and inspiration to many generations of people. The difficulty with this standard of appraisal is that it cannot be applied to the work of today. It has been necessary, therefore, to find another way of judging modern art; and this has been done by an analysis of older and proven works, to discover what common characteristics are basic to their greatness.

No fault can be found with this method—except that it lends itself to great differences of opinion among the experts. When the results of the analysis are tabulated and then applied in the judgment of modern works, there at once appears a serious disagreement on the part of the judges. The very same picture, or piece of sculpture, or musical composition, or poem, will be praised to the sky by some, and utterly condemned by others.

What, then, must the person in quest of culture do? This

much, perhaps. He must familiarize himself with much of the art that has stood the test of time—with the music, painting, and poetry of the established masters. These proven works he must learn, through familiarity, to love and enjoy. But he must do far more. He must be equally alive to the art of his own day, listening often to its music, looking at its painting, and reading its literature. Out of these two sets of personal experiences, and after giving some thought to the critical opinions of the experts, he will come at last to develop artistic standards of his own. He will know what he enjoys, and will be in a position to defend his good taste.

Artistic appreciation, like every other part of culture, is hard to acquire. It demands a strong and sustained effort, and it takes time. There is one thing, however, you can do at once—one thing that will help mightily in your esthetic development. You can cultivate the open mind. If you succeed in doing that, you will have accomplished more than some of the experts have so far managed to achieve!

Let us be quite clear about what is meant by open-mindedness. It definitely does not mean being blown in this or that direction by every veering wind of taste or opinion. To be open-minded does not mean you will eagerly accept every new notion and lend your enthusiastic support to every new fad. It means you will fair-mindedly examine everything, either old or new, that is brought to your attention. It means you will give everything that comes to you an honest and discriminating trial. If it stands up to the trial, you will then whole-heartedly accept it—but if it fails to do so, you will insist upon your right to reject it.

One last point regarding personal culture in all its four aspects. No matter how long you live and how cultured you become, there will never come a time when you can say, "I am now cultured. I can now sit back and take it easy." The

moment you do so, you will begin to go gently backwards. You can never be cultured once and for all: the world ceaselessly changes, and with it the whole pattern of human life.

Let us consider the point. On the side of knowledge, science marches steadily ahead; on the side of skills, new and better ways of doing things are constantly being found; on the side of social behaviour, there are broad changes from each generation to the next; and on the side of artistic appreciation, new works of art are daily being created.

Surely it is obvious that the culturally perfect man of today—if such a marvellous person exists!—must keep abreast of his world, or he will become the culturally imperfect man of tomorrow. In Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking-Glass*, there is a place where the Red Queen runs and runs like mad—only to find herself exactly where she was before she began. That is an accurate account of the cultured man's situation: he must strive with all his might, in order to remain as cultured as he is.

CHAPTER 21

FAMILY LIVING

REFERENCE is made to the family in several other parts of this book, but the subject is so important and the problems involved are so grave that a separate chapter is in order. For the sake of clearness, here is a list of the topics to be discussed: The Modern Family; The Marriage Relationship; Parents and Children; Brothers and Sisters; and Associations beyond the Home. This will by no means be a complete treatment, but it may open your eyes and provide you with material for reflection.

THE MODERN FAMILY

An immense change has come over the family since our grandparents' time. Formerly it was a large group of relatives who lived close together and won their livelihood from the land. Now it is a tiny unit, comprising parents and their children, living chiefly in cities, and depending for employment on business and industry. Whereas the old family remained for many generations in one place, the modern family moves wherever opportunity beckons; and whereas members of the old family were approximately at the same social level, members of the new family go up or down the social scale in accordance with individual talent, ambition, and luck.

We are living in a much less leisurely and more competitive age—an age that puts tremendous emphasis upon financial success. Thus the modern family lives under pressure, vies for status with other families, and struggles

continuously for economic advancement. It is forever on the *qui vive* to keep up with the Joneses, and strains its resources to that end. It competes through everything it has—its home, its garden, its car—and worst of all, it frequently competes through its children.

Note the effects of this last. "My Willie," says the proud parent, "is captain of the football team," or "My Susie took first-class honours in her music examination." This, of course, reduces the other parent to gloomy silence, and he goes home to force a little brilliancy out of his own child. He feels he has been let down and mortified, as his son Charlie, who has no particular gifts, is made to realize. So Charlie is driven headlong into the competitive game, and used as an instrument for enhancing the family prestige.

This is all very distressing, and calls for a great deal of understanding on the part of parents and children. The trouble is that such understanding is by no means common. The useless competition goes on and on, till everyone is either hardened or exhausted.

Again, there is far less security in the modern family than there was in its older counterpart—especially for the young and for the aged. The state has had to step in with family allowances and old-age pensions. The family of today lives in a small house or an apartment, and has little room for dependent relatives. Also, it is very subject to disruption, so that children are often in a precarious situation. The breakdown of the family casts them out upon the tender mercies of the world.

It would be sheer blindness, however, to overlook the advantages of the modern family. It is dynamic and progressive as well as self-centred and competitive. Its mobility has given it a wider range of experience, and its opportunity to rise in the social scale has broadened its culture. It provides a more stimulating intellectual back-

ground for children, takes better care of their health, and gives them a more vigorous start in the world. Moreover, it has come to stay. We shall never go back to a simpler society, and it is our obvious business to develop and improve the one we have.

THE MARRIAGE RELATIONSHIP

Here, at its best, is the finest relationship known to mankind—at its worst, the most miserable.

There is every evidence that for many people the marriage bond is no longer looked upon as permanent, that it is regarded as a civil contract to be dissolved at will by either of the contracting parties. The outcome of this attitude is an increasingly chaotic society, and a vast number of unhappy children.

Let us glance at three reasons for so distressing a state of affairs—in the hope that you will avoid these pitfalls, and achieve a permanent and satisfying marriage of your own when the good day comes.

First, the whole tendency of our times is toward individualism. The small, competitive family has placed a premium on personal development and the expansion of the ego. We are so acutely conscious of our rights as persons, we find it difficult to merge our interests with those of another.

You can imagine the result when two determined—and sometimes very rugged—individualists are joined in marriage. The slogan on both sides is “No compromise!” Each partner is always in the right. Bickerings grow into downright quarrels, and every quarrel is more acrimonious than the last. After a little of this they part in high dudgeon, and another matrimonial venture is closed.

Second, we expect far too much of marriage. We

surround it with so rich an atmosphere of glamour and romance that it is idealized right out of this world. Perhaps we have seen too many motion pictures and read too many sentimental novels. At all events, we marry for love alone, and take the rest for granted. The secret of marriage, we suppose, is to find the one and only affinity, and to live thereafter in a state of uninterrupted bliss.

Now this is all very childish indeed. Few people, if any, marry angels or demi-gods. Each one of us has scores of potential 'affinities', and it is a matter of geography which of them we meet. As for marriage itself, it has its periods of rapture, of course, but it includes long prosaic and practical stretches as well. It involves such unromantic activities as dish-washing and budget-making and baby-sitting. It calls for a good deal of toleration and self-sacrifice. Love is a very essential ingredient, but for more reasons than are generally supposed. One of the great values of love—and this does not detract in the least from its elysian quality—is that it carries the partners through the first difficult years of their mutual readjustment.

Third, there is an old saw that says: "Marry in haste and repent at leisure." Like most old saws, this one conveys a well-established truth. It also contains a warning. When Judy Smith and Jack Robinson, who have known each other for two months, suddenly decide to get married, they are taking a grave risk. They have revealed only their best sides to each other. Judy has appeared only in the role of a perfectly groomed and starry-eyed beauty, while Jack has displayed nothing but the most courtly and delicate consideration. So they marry, and discover to their dismay that each of them has a great many characteristics that were not in evidence at all. Neither Judy's curl-papers nor Jack's tendency to sulkiness were included in the bargain. So they are disappointed and disillusioned, and unless they have

more than ordinary good sense are probably headed for divorce.

Therefore beware! Of all the hazards that lie in the way of marital success, you can at least be on your guard against three. If you avoid excessive individualism, foolish romanticism, and ridiculous haste, you will have a far better chance to be happy.

PARENTS AND CHILDREN

The small modern family, whatever its faults, has the merit of producing much greater intimacy between parents and children. This is an advantage of the first importance.

It is worth noting that the relationship between parents and children provides for a remarkable dove-tailing of needs, and because of this it is a perfect expression of our human nature. The child is dependent, the parent protective; the child appeals for affection, the parent delights in giving it; the child stands in need of guidance and instruction, the parent loves to direct and teach; the child is a hero-worshipper, the parent rejoices in this uncritical admiration, and tries very hard to deserve it. No such beautiful balancing of needs exists anywhere outside the family.

Parents do many things for their children—so many that they are beyond calculation, and only a few of them can be mentioned here. The following four are selections from a very long list.

1. The ordinary living habits of children are established by their parents—cleanliness, modesty, table-manners, speech, common courtesy, personal grooming, and the like. These form the foundation of later acceptability and attractiveness, and should never be underestimated.

2. Parents are talent-finders. They are on the watch for particular gifts, and usually encourage the child to develop

them. You can imagine the importance of this as a basis for our modern effort to fit round pegs into round holes.

The process of talent-finding, however, is not without its perils. Sometimes a very small gift is given an over-zealous encouragement with disastrous and heart-breaking results.

3. Parents provide a moral pattern and lay down standards of behaviour for their children. The small modern family makes for more consistency in this regard, since only two adults are involved instead of half a dozen. Early morals are taken right out of the family atmosphere. It is a notable thing that although people may modify their moral outlook in later life, they always retain an underlying respect for the code they learned in childhood.

4. The attitudes of the child are largely those of his parents. If the parents are tolerant, the child will be tolerant too; if they are musical, the child will be receptive to music. Unfortunately, this principle can work in reverse. The prejudices and bigotries of parents are equally infectious—from these also no child is immune. The child is quick to sense the real attitude that lies behind the conventional mask, and will adopt it whether his parents wish him to or not.

One point more in regard to the parent-child relationship. This is the perplexing question of control and discipline. Most people agree that when the child is young, control should be firm, consistent, and kind. But what of the adolescent stage? Is this a time when control should be strengthened or relaxed? Here is a question that would furnish excellent material for a debate.

Probably no final answer is to be found, but it may be in order to suggest a line of thought. The outcome to be desired is self-control. Self-control can be achieved only through its exercise, since there can be no development without a measure of freedom. It would follow that parental

control should gradually be lessened, and the child's power of choice increased. If genuine maturity is to be reached—and we may assume that genuine maturity includes intelligent discrimination and sound moral judgment—then there must be a steady increase of personal responsibility throughout the adolescent years. Self-discipline and wise decision are not things that spring suddenly into existence at the age of twenty-one.

BROTHERS AND SISTERS

The modern family has repeatedly been described as small. As the size of the family has an obvious bearing on brother and sister relationships it seems wise to supply a few facts on the declining birth-rate.

Note first that the natural birth-rate in a well-balanced population is in the region of 50 per thousand people. This has seldom been reached during the past century, but from 1867-1913 the European Russian birth-rate averaged 48.9.

Decline of the birth-rate can readily be shown. In western and northern Europe it declined from 31.9 in 1841-45 to 18.3 in 1928. In the United States it fell 54 per cent between 1860 and 1940. In the year 1942, the birth-rate for England and Wales was 15.8; for the United States 21.0; and for Canada 23.3. There was a slight rise during the war years, but the downward trend is now in evidence again. In the light of these figures, you will not be surprised to learn that the 'only child' is becoming more common, and is to be found in one completed family out of every five.

Sometimes it is convenient to use a technical term. The expression 'brothers and sisters' is a clumsy one, and sociologists have introduced the word 'siblings' to take its place. With this apology, we shall speak of siblings in what is left of the chapter.

Siblings educate one another in a thousand ways, and together form a miniature society. They furnish the child with his first experience of social living and rub off the crude edges of his egoism. They enable him to take the first reluctant steps from selfish individuality to unselfish mutuality.

Sibling interaction operates in four main ways, though each of these is a large field in itself and includes many varieties of behaviour.

1. The association of siblings is almost all-inclusive. They spend many hours of every day in one another's company, and many years of life in the same home. They play together, eat together, work together. They wear each other's clothes and share each other's toys. Quarrel though they may from time to time—and how in such close contact could they do otherwise?—they develop a strong similarity of outlook and build up enduring bonds of affection.

2. Sibling interaction is marked by the utmost frankness. Since there is no escape from each other's society, and since no flaws of personality can remain hidden, sibling remarks are blunt and often brutal. Weaknesses are plainly discussed; evasions are dragged into the light of day; motives are laid bare for everyone to see. No one is better able than a sibling to put his finger on a sore spot with the intention—and the effect—of making his victim squirm. Siblings provide a hard school that equips the child for his dealings with a hard world.

3. The intimate association of siblings is a natural remedy for seclusiveness and the over-tendency to make-believe. It renders the child social instead of shy, and enables him to be easy in his personal relations with other people. We shall treat this matter more fully in our discussion of the only child.

4. The last main way in which sibling interaction operates is in teaching the child to give and take. It

acquaints him, through direct and unsparing means, with the rights of others. He is forced by experience to compromise, to co-operate, to be considerate. The egoist has short shrift in sibling society—his egoism soon becomes a burden too great for him to bear.

* * * * *

This brings us to that rather under-privileged person, the only child; and the most obvious remark to make about him is that he lacks the training afforded by sibling interaction. He is deprived of close intimacy with other children; he is not exposed to frank criticism; he is left to spend much of his time in a make-believe world; and he does not have his egoism reduced by the normal experience of give and take.

As a result, he tends to be ego-centric, sensitive, over-imaginative, unsocial, and self-indulgent. Unless he has the good fortune to achieve membership in a vigorous peer group, his chances of developing a healthy and companionable personality are somewhat below the average.

Furthermore, he is thrown too much upon the society of adults. He is likely to become precocious in his speech and old-fashioned in his ways. These peculiarities make him less attractive to other children, while he on his side is apt to regard other children as hopelessly juvenile and crude.

Again, since he is an only child, his parents have a tendency to over-protect him. They are probably over-solicitous about his health, his manners, and his success at school. They may regard him as a precious flower to be shielded from the rough winds of this inhospitable world. So he is in danger of being turned into a model of self-complacency or an unhappy milksop.

It is also worth noting that a child brought up under these conditions is inclined to be socially defenceless. Being ignorant of the sharp practice so common in group life, he

may be taken advantage of on all sides and quite callously be used to serve the self-interest of his contemporaries.

There are, however, some benefits to be had from being an only child. Strange though this may seem after what has been said, it is nevertheless true. Indeed, with so many single-child families in our midst, it had better be true!

These benefits attach to the economic and the cultural aspects of life. The single-child family is more apt to be well-to-do. It can therefore provide superior care and a better education. It is also able to supply a more gracious home, a finer selection of books, and a richer opportunity for cultivation of music and the arts.

In a word, when the only child combines the advantages of his home with intimate membership of a peer group, he is by no means as severely handicapped as he would seem.

ASSOCIATIONS BEYOND THE HOME

With the consideration of this topic we shall round out the account of family living. No family, however close-knit and self-sufficient, can live unto itself alone. There must be many outside contacts and affiliations, and these range all the way from dealings at the local grocery to fellowship with our dearest friends. They include our membership of churches, societies and clubs, our participation in athletic and esthetic activities, our support of political parties, and our vocational pursuits. For children, they chiefly cluster around the school, the church, and the peer group.

It is manifestly impossible to cover the whole of this, so we shall confine our brief discussion to the two most important outcomes of extra-family association.

First, what is the cultural effect upon the child of relationships beyond the home?

Note well the answer to this. Every great nation has its national culture, its unique pattern of life. It has its

individual solution to the universal problems of gaining a livelihood, establishing standards of comfort and welfare, promoting the arts, educating children, fostering religion, and living together. This general culture pervades and sustains all our institutions and sets its mark on every citizen.

The national culture, however, is subject to some variation from one region to another. It varies again from one community to another and from one neighbourhood to another. Thus, no two families interpret the national culture in exactly the same way. Each family, in some degree, has its own version and pursues its own way of life.

One effect, then, of outside associations is to supplement the family culture pattern by exposing the child to wider—and perhaps purer—aspects of the national culture. It is to this task that the school, the church, and numerous welfare organizations address themselves. Associations beyond the home fill out and correct the family pattern, and have the invaluable effect of keeping us culturally together.

Second, what is the moral effect of outside contacts and affiliations? Unhappily, in this field it is not possible to give so favourable an answer, for it is more than probable that a good home provides a better situation for character development than does the outside world. True, the church and the school strive with all their might to reinforce the efforts of the conscientious home, but much of this work can be undone by corruptive elements in the community.

There is, however, one almost universal occurrence of which you should be aware, namely, the conflict of moral codes that can scarcely be avoided in our modern society. The moment the city child steps beyond the confines of his home, he cannot but see that many other people do not adhere to the principles upheld by his family. He may in

course of time—and especially at adolescence—challenge the family code as hopelessly out of date or too rigidly severe.

This did not occur in simpler rural society, for the reason that the same standards of behaviour were common to the whole community, and no conflict arose unless the young person went off to seek his fortune in a more cosmopolitan place. Now it is a common event, and poses a difficult problem.

The solution is hard to find. Perhaps it lies in a less unconscious and more intelligent acceptance of morality by the child. Every moral rule that contains vitality and worth is capable of being defended on logical grounds. It can be presented in such a way as to make an intellectual impression on the mind and thereby produce conviction. Such a procedure—suited, of course, to the mental level of the child—might establish moral character on a stronger and more resistant foundation.

CHAPTER 22

HOW TO GET ALONG WITH OTHER PEOPLE

NO NORMAL person lives by himself: everyone lives in a family, a community, a nation. Our interdependence being what it is—due to the specialization of work in modern society—we are wholly unable to stand alone. Not only are we interdependent in the economic sense, we are also bound up with one another in the emotional sense; for our deepest satisfactions arise from our associations with our fellows. Love and intimacy, friendship, a circle of acquaintance, even the myriad casual contacts of life—all these are necessary to our happiness.

This being so clearly true, it becomes a matter of the utmost importance that we get along in a pleasant way with other people. You must have noticed, many times over, that your most miserable moments have almost invariably followed your failure to do so. Your popularity, your prestige, and the esteem in which you are held, depend very largely on your possession of social techniques. And social techniques can be acquired.

In discussing the question of getting along with other people, we shall take two things for granted: first, that you are a well-intentioned and reasonably attractive person; and second, that you are genuinely anxious to be a social success. This much is essential; and if it is safely conceded, we can go on to examine the techniques mentioned in the previous paragraph.

Here is a general statement of the whole matter: Getting on with other people is based on a nice balance of ego-

enhancements, theirs and yours. Your problem is to build up the self-respect of others without doing damage to your own, and to build up your own without unduly diminishing theirs. What you have to establish is a sort of ego-equilibrium reasonably fair to the needs of both parties—no mean achievement, as you doubtless realize! To quote a rather crude expression that puts the general technique in a nutshell, “You must make the other fellow feel good”. To which might be added the phrase, “—so long as you don’t make yourself feel unbearably bad”.

With this fundamental principle in mind, let us see how it can be worked out in practice. A four-point programme of action will show you the way.

1. You must acquire a reliable insight into human needs, motives, frustrations, and resulting behaviour.

2. You yourself must be an interesting person: reasonably cultured, humorous, and cheerful.

3. You must take pains to enhance—whenever desirable and always with sufficient finesse—the egos of other people.

4. You must be willing, in certain situations and in the company of certain persons, to play yourself down. Under no circumstances whatever must you be forward, boastful, and domineering.

THE BORE

Before going on to discuss this four-point programme, it may be worth while, by way of contrast, to describe that social incompetent, the bore. He, of course, is the ‘horrible example’, the man above all others who is distressing to his fellows.

What is he like? Needless to say, he is not always the same, but the following characteristics are found in the majority of cases. He is quite unaware of the fact that other people have interests and problems altogether different from



his own, and as a result he is socially insensitive and rather wanting in sympathy. He drones ceaselessly on, talking about himself, his affairs, and his achievements, and merely raises his voice when anyone endeavours to argue a point or give a new direction to the so-called conversation. He labours always under the strange delusion that people enjoy listening to him; and he is apparently blind to their boredom and the efforts they make to quit his exhausting society. Perhaps he is more to be pitied than blamed, but his ego-enhancement is so powerful and persistent, it passes all bounds of decorum.

According to a popular saying, "A bore is a man who insists on talking about his interests when you want to talk about yours". This definition is altogether too kind! The bore is really a man who insists on talking about his interests all the time—whether there is anything you want to say or

not. His greatest offence is that he robs you of your liberty: you are compelled by common courtesy to wait in speechless impatience till he runs down.

Consider, for example, Cyril Milligan. Whenever you see him approaching, you dodge down the first side-street. If there is no side-street handy, you quicken your pace and pretend you are in a breathless hurry. Yet Cyril is a nice-looking fellow, who means no possible harm. Then why do you avoid him? Because he talks boringly and endlessly about radio transmission—because he is incapable of seeing your utter lack of interest in that topic—because, so far as he is concerned, there is no other topic. Not only this, you have the utmost difficulty in getting away from him. So, to protect your time and patience, you take immediate steps—down the first side-street.

THE WAY TO BECOME A SOCIAL SUCCESS

Let us be done with bores, however, and come back to the four-point programme for achieving social success. That will be more practical and constructive.

First: *Insight into Human Nature*. This is an obvious first point, since you cannot get on with other people, unless you understand their motives and can predict their probable behaviour. Without knowledge of these things, you would be in the position of a child playing with dangerous chemicals in a laboratory—at any moment you might set off an explosion.

How is this insight to be obtained? In many ways. It is to be got by reading such a book as this one, and by shrewd observation of all the people with whom you come in contact. If you seek it, there is scarcely a situation in life that will not serve to enlighten you.

But a general knowledge of human nature is not enough. It is necessary also to study each individual, because motives

vary in strength from one person to another, and are satisfied in different ways. All people, for example, desire companionship; but some desire it more than others, and the choice of companions is not the same in any two persons. Again, all people desire food; but some have heartier appetites than others, and food preferences vary from one individual to the next. Thus the interests of no two human beings are alike.

Furthermore, frustration has a different effect on different people. One man, an impatient, excitable creature, is tremendously worked up over the small matter of a flat tire; his neighbour, a calm, philosophical man, is quite unmoved in the same situation. One man deeply resents a small and entirely unintentional slight; another is ready to overlook a serious injury. And so it goes. No matter how well we know what men in general will do under certain circumstances, we have to study each individual before we can know exactly what *he* will do.

You must, therefore, study the members of your immediate circle—the people with whom you especially want to get along. You must know their chief interests, the main sources of their pleasure, their small aversions, and the things they most cordially dislike. You must know something of their intelligence, their temperament, and the past experiences that have conditioned them. You must be familiar with the sequences that make up their minds—the opinions and beliefs, the enthusiasms and prejudices that influence their judgment. And you must be sympathetically aware of the ego-enhancements by which they hide their limitations and defects from the eyes of the world.

This is what is meant by insight into human nature. It is not to be obtained without genuine effort, and it is not to be obtained in a day. Yet, it is your only reliable compass in navigating the difficult seas of social life. Without it, you

may steer your ship far off the course, and even pile her on the rocks.

Second: *You Yourself Must be Interesting*. No matter how deep your understanding of other people, you will still fail unless your own personality is an attractive one. This, of course, is a matter almost entirely within your own control. Your personality consists of your habits—physical, mental, emotional—and every habit you possess is open to modification. Even if nature has not been kind to you in the facial and bodily way, you can overcome the handicap by the steady development of charm, good sense, and sympathy.

In the main, to be interesting is to be fully cultured. Wide and accurate knowledge, numerous and useful skills, sound and considerate social behaviour, possession of genuine artistic values—these are the foundations of lasting esteem and respect. All this has already been discussed: the problem now is to analyse the socially acceptable personality in practical detail.

On analysis, and laying aside knowledge, skills, and esthetic appreciation, the following matters seem to be especially important: facial expression, voice and speech, vitality, humour, manners, character, breadth of interests, sympathy and consideration, and personal grooming. Let us briefly consider each of these.

1. *Facial Expression*. This has been put first because it is the most obvious. Many people fall socially short because their facial expression is stern or grave or immobile. Such people seem disapproving or aloof or quite uninterested. They tend to freeze other people off and drive them away. On the other hand, nothing is more encouraging than a cheerful and friendly expression. People with pleasant, kindly faces are attractive for that alone.

Now facial expression is due to the way you habitually

hold the muscles of your face. Determined practice can work an amazing change. Cultivate smiles, vivacity, eagerness, and warmth, and you will take a long step toward social success.

2. *Voice and Speech.* Much has been said about these already. Your voice is your personal instrument, and it must be played melodiously. It must be well-modulated, never harsh or strident, always in keeping with the ideas and emotions you are using it to convey.

Your speech should be fluent, grammatical, well pronounced, and easily understood. It should be up to the best standards of your circle of acquaintance. If you can avoid accent, well and good; but if not, then let your accent be genuine and not artificial.

3. *Vitality.* Here is a difficult, but very attractive, trait to cultivate. It is based, of course, on a sound constitution and good health. Proper exercise, sufficient sleep, and a well-balanced diet will do much to produce it. But if your vitality is somewhat lacking, as at times it may be, you must not on that account go round with dragging feet and a despondent look. To do so is to make everyone else miserable. In such a case you must, by sheer determination, put a spring in your step and cheerfulness into your expression. You must try, like a good actor, to create an appearance of the vitality you do not feel.

4. *Humour.* This also has been dealt with already. What is required, you will remember, is keen observation of incongruities, and an ability to exhibit them to others with drollery but without a sting. There is, however, a second side to the matter: you must be responsive to the humour of others. A tremendously important point! You must be quick to see the incongruities they point out, and ready with your chuckles. A humorist is a little like an artist or musician: he needs above all things a sympathetic and appreci-

ative audience. Respond to his sallies, and you will win his heart.

5. *Manners.* A very great deal is made of good manners in our society—and rightly so. Manners have been described as the oil that smooths down the action of the social machine. They cover all the ordinary situations of life; possessing them, we almost always know how to behave; without them, we are uncertain, clumsy, and even boorish.

Manners vary greatly at different social levels. At one level, no man may sit down to a meal with his coat off; at another, he may wear his coat or remove it as he pleases. In one group, men invariably rise to their feet when a lady enters the room to join the circle; in another, rising in such fashion would make the man conspicuous and the lady self-conscious. Some manners are doubtless to be preferred, but courtesy demands that you adjust your manners to your society.

The standard here, as in speech, is the best found among your circle of acquaintances. This standard you must acquire and uphold. But the essence of courtesy is to make other people feel at ease. Manners, however polished, that make other people feel embarrassed or inferior, are bad manners and cannot be defended.

There is a delightful story that illustrates the point—a story told of a recent British King who was famous for his tact. At the close of a very elegant state dinner at which the King presided, a certain man—quite unaccustomed to such affairs and painfully nervous—picked up his finger-bowl when it was set before him, and drank the water. The action was noticed, and a sneering smile began to appear on the faces of some of the guests. The King, immediately aware of the situation, raised his finger-bowl, nodded to the man, and quaffed the contents as if he were drinking his health. It was a shining act of courtesy—and a rebuke.



6. *Character.* The emphasis here is on such aspects of character as immediately affect our associates—truthfulness, honesty, reliability, promptitude, and the like. There is no intention to preach a sermonette on the subject. The value of such traits is beyond all argument. Good manners and pleasing talk may carry you along for a time, but your permanent standing in society will depend on your character.

7. *Breadth of Interests.* Interests largely arise out of our knowledge, skills, and artistic activities. The broader our culture, the broader our interests. From the strictly social point of view, breadth of interest is mainly valuable because it enables us to take an intelligent share in the interests of other people. It enables us to listen to them with eager attention, to draw them out, and to make sensible comments on the subjects they love to discuss.

To illustrate: You are often in the company of an enthusiastic tennis player, and his good opinion means something

to you. If your interests include tennis, you have no difficulty. If you can talk with reasonable understanding about tennis-players, past and present, about court strategy and strokes and styles of play, there will never be a dull moment between you. If, however, your interests do not include tennis, you may be hard put to it to find a means of mutual entertainment.

You will meet many people in the course of your life—teachers, tailors and tug-boat captains. If you are to get along with them, your interests must somewhere overlap. To be socially successful, you must have interests numerous and varied enough to provide a common ground of conversation, no matter whom you meet.

Most of the time, however, you are in the company of people you know well, and with whose interests you are very familiar. This makes your problem an easy one. All you have to do in the ordinary course of things is to share in the quite limited range of interests you find around you. And you can do so by the simple process of keeping your eyes and ears intelligently open.

8. *Sympathy and Consideration.* Everyone whose heart is in the right place takes naturally to this. It consists in feeling yourself into another person's emotion or mood, and in harmonizing your behaviour with his needs. It means rejoicing with the happy and sorrowing with the sad.

You must be careful, though, to introduce a heartening note into your sympathy with those whose spirits are depressed. It is possible, as you well know, to sympathize over much, and so make your poor friend more dejected than before. True consideration calls for comfort of the practical kind—for the building up of fortitude and hope. Your aim must be to 'assuage grief' by restoring your friend to a better state of mind.

9. *Personal Grooming.* This has purposely been given

last place, because it is perhaps the least important of the points under consideration. Yet it has its place. In spite of the fact that a lively, humorous, and sympathetic companion is attractive no matter how he looks, it is nevertheless true that personal grooming would make him more attractive still. This is especially so in the case of a girl. To be a complete social success, therefore, you must take some pains with your appearance. Here is a point to remember. No matter how fully your appearance may be taken for granted by those who know you well, the same is not true of casual acquaintances and strangers. You are seen before you are heard—and first impressions are often lasting.

Third: *Enhance Other People's Egos*. A great deal has been said on this subject, and you are doubtless well aware of its importance. Everyone is keenly interested in his significance, prestige, and popularity; and everyone—consciously or unconsciously—is forever engaged in establishing his little place in the sun.

What course of action is therefore clearly indicated? It can be put in a few simple sentences. Build your friend up. Consult his interests. Give him credit for his achievements. Throw him the conversational ball. Speak well of him in his absence. Criticize him with sympathy and restraint.

One word of warning, however! Do not overdo the process, or you will be in danger of turning your friend into a self-satisfied and unbearable prig. If you make yourself a sort of door-mat, with no interests and opinions of your own, the friendship will be a poor affair. Maintain a proper balance. Avoid being a 'yes-man'. When you criticize, do so constructively and with judgment. Enhance your friend's ego by all means, but with proper discretion and without injury to your own.

Fourth: *Play Yourself Down*. This is the last item in the

four-point plan of action, and it is not intended for humble and socially diffident people. If you are of that type, you may ignore this item completely. It is not a common type, however, and for ninety-nine people out of a hundred, the advice to play down the ego is both sound and needful. Social intercourse is marked by the nice balancing of egos, and most of us are a little over-eager to enhance our own.

There are some situations in which the playing down of the ego is especially desirable. Reasonable modesty is a virtue at all times, but in the company of parents, teachers, employers, and older people in general, self-restraint is not only proper but wise. Our social success depends on our elders and superiors as well as on our contemporaries and equals. Indeed, so far as getting along in the world is concerned, these elders and superiors have a vast amount of influence over our lives. To enhance our egos at their expense is a short-sighted and foolish procedure.

Consider a case. Jimmy Saddler is a very bright, rather forward boy, who loves to get into the limelight—a 'smart-aleck', if you like the term. One of his teachers is an oldish man whose thinking is not as quick and exact as it once was. The teacher makes a mistake in an algebra problem he is working on the blackboard, and Jimmy is after him like a terrier. Not content with pointing out the error, Jimmy goes back a couple of steps in the problem and demonstrates—with an appearance of great simplicity—that no one above the level of an idiot could be so wrong.

What has Jimmy gained? A moment in the spotlight; an exhibition of his exalted ability; a victory at the expense of his teacher. And what has he lost? Very much more. He has shown himself blatant and heartless; he has antagonized three-quarters of the class; he has made it difficult for the teacher to regard him with affection and respect. Jimmy is little better than a fool. The probability is he will be en-

couraged by the incident to go a little farther on the next occasion—and when he grows up and enters the business or professional world, he will soon reduce his popularity to zero.

Illustrations might be multiplied; but sufficient has been said to establish the point that playing one's self down is a social proceeding of no mean value, and well worth bearing in mind.

The chapter may be summarized in a few words. No one but yourself can make you a social success. The four-point programme we have discussed can do no more than bring the problem of getting along with other people clearly and fully to your attention. What use you make of the analysis is entirely your own affair.

* * * * *

We have now reached the end of Part I of this book. The whole question of personal development has been considered, and it is to be hoped you have acquired much insight into human nature. In Part II, we shall go on to the consideration of social development, with a view to your gaining an insight into the workings of human society. Understanding both man and his society, you will be equipped to face most of the problems of democratic life.

PART II

SOCIAL
DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER 23

SOCIETY

THE purpose in Part II is to study man in his social relationships: to see how his society is organized, and to examine the means by which he is developed into an acceptable member of that society. To a great many people, society is a bewildering thing, immensely complex and immensely hard to understand. They are apt to take it for granted, much as they take the weather; and to say such matters are quite beyond their grasp. They know a little more as to how a child comes to be a typical Canadian or a typical Norwegian—but even here their knowledge is sketchy and superficial. They mention ‘Education’, and let it go at that.

Now all this is an unsatisfactory state of affairs. Everyone can grasp the main facts and principles of social organization; and everyone can understand the processes by which a child becomes Canadianized or Americanized or whatever his situation demands. There is no mystery about these things. All that is needed is a little clear thinking. You may be very sure the whole matter—complex and confusing though it seems—can be simplified down by analysis to a few simple ideas.

The purpose now is to put you in possession of these ideas. We shall proceed as before, with emphasis on *observation*, *illustration*, and *discussion*, toward the developing of clear *insight*. There may be difficult stretches, but in the main the road is reasonably smooth and straight.

THE NATURE OF SOCIETY

Man has always lived in a society: there has never been a time when he lived alone. And always his society has been organized. You can see at once that the very nature of human infancy must, from the dawn of man's existence, have made an organized group necessary. Even among the most primitive and brutish people, the infant had to be cared for by his mother, protected and provided for by his father. Otherwise babies simply could not have survived, and the race would have perished. You can see also that even at that early period, there was some division of labour and responsibility: the woman was the home-maker who prepared food, stitched together rude garments, and tended the young; the man was the hunter and the guardian of the family. Rough and simple this society undoubtedly was, but it was an organized society nevertheless.

Note this point well: *The earliest social group was the family.* It is from the family our highly complex modern society has developed. Everything that can be found in our society today was present in simple or embryonic form in the earliest social group of all. Whatever you care to mention—government, education, industry, medicine, or art—was represented in the life of the primitive family.

With this much established, let us turn to the meaning of the word 'society'. Obviously, we must have an agreed and definite understanding of a word we are using so much. It is rather generally accepted that three things are necessary to the existence of a society, and indicate its *nature*, namely:

1. Recognition of common needs and interests.
2. An adequate means of communication.
3. Intelligent co-operation for achieving common ends.

This, of course, is scarcely a definition, but in some

respects it is better than a definition. By considering each of the three items in turn, we shall clear up several important points.

1. *Recognition of Common Needs and Interests.* This is present, though often in a very humble degree, among all animals that live in groups. A tribe of monkeys is aware of common needs and interests—so also is a flock of geese or a school of whales. But there are very different levels of awareness, ranging from the clear awareness of men to the dim awareness of ants and bees. Indeed, the difference of level is so great, we speak of 'thought' in the first case and of 'blind instinct' in the second. Man genuinely recognizes the common bond, ants and bees maintain it instinctively.

The deciding factor is intelligence. The higher the intelligence, the more clear is the recognition. Man is the only creature whose recognition can be called definite and complete. Thus, only among men can there be a society in the fullest sense.

2. *An Adequate Means of Communication.* It would be foolish to say the lower animals do not communicate with one another. Over and over again, it has been proved they do. The warning caw of the crow, the howl of the wolf, the cluck of the hen—all these convey undoubted meaning. But bird and animal calls comprise an extremely limited vocabulary. If you had time, you could set it down in a few words, of which 'Come!' 'Food!' and 'Danger!' would probably be the chief. Even when their physical movements are included, the lower animals can convey little. The wagging of your dog's tail, the pricking of his ears, the slobbering of his jaws, the baring of his teeth—what do they mean? Just joy, attention, hunger, and anger. When all their means of communication are duly taken into account, creatures below man are woefully lacking in the power to transmit or exchange information.



This, however, is far from being the whole story. Not only does human language include everything an animal can convey, but it is incalculably superior in two respects. It can transmit shades and exactitudes of meaning; and it can express abstract as well as concrete ideas.

Consider these two respects for a moment. When a dog barks with all his might at the postman, what exactly does he mean? The barking expresses excitement, or insult, or threat, or mere sense of guardianship. But which? If the postman has had previous experience with the dog, he can perhaps answer the question. There may be a few shades of meaning in a dog's bark, but there is certainly no exactitude—and the same is true of every animal cry.

Again, a dog may have some vague awareness of such abstractions as courage, fair treatment, and dignity, but

they are far beyond the range of his expression. He is limited because he does not think and express himself in *words*. Words are rather exact symbols not only for things, but also for the relationships between things; and it is through words that man is so supreme in the matter of communication. How animals think we do not know, but we believe they think in pictures, and in mental images arising from the experience of their other senses. They think, that is to say, not in terms of words, but in terms of sensory memories in the fields of sight, hearing, smell, taste, and so on. If you would like to get inside the mind of a lower animal, try to think in such terms! And then, if you care to attempt the impossible, try to communicate your sensory images without using words.

Once more, the deciding factor is intelligence. Man is the only creature whose means of communication is sufficiently ample and exact to support his thinking and to transmit everything he wishes to convey; and on this second score also, there can be no true society below the human level.

3. *Intelligent Co-operation for Achieving Common Ends.* All animals co-operate to a certain extent. Wolves co-operate in packs when they hunt; lions and even snakes co-operate in pairs for the same reason; bees co-operate in hives to sustain the common life. But all this co-operation, even at the level of the wolf or lion, is directed toward very simple and obvious ends. No one ever heard of wolves sitting down in serious council to *plan* their activities in detail, or to work out steps by which to achieve a distant goal.

Intelligent co-operation calls for four things: a clear realization of the end to be attained; a means of full and accurate communication; a consciousness of social unity; and sufficient intelligence to make sound and forward-looking plans. It seems reasonably obvious that these four things are found only among men.


To sum up the discussion: If the existence of a society depends on recognition of common needs and interests, an adequate means of communication, and intelligent co-operation for achieving common ends, then there is no such thing as a society except among human beings. But a second deduction may also be made: Every group of human beings does not compose a society. Consider the following: A group of immigrants from half a dozen different countries; a group of prisoners in a penitentiary; a group of people travelling on a street-car; a group of tourists visiting an art gallery.

By way of an exercise, here are a few groups you may classify on your own account. Which of these may truly be said to compose a society?—the inhabitants of London; a class of children in school; the membership of a tennis club; a crew of construction-men; a rioting mob; the congregation of a church; a student body; a crowd of people at a fire; shipwrecked people on an island; residents of an apartment house; onlookers at a baseball game; listeners to a radio programme; members of a legislature; customers in a restaurant; a medical association.

THE FUNCTION OF SOCIETY

Let us now turn from the nature of a society to its function, and see why it is that societies exist. There is no difficulty here. The function of a society is to satisfy the needs of the individuals who make it up. Apart from satisfying needs, it has no function at all.

By this time you are well acquainted with the fundamental needs of man, and it will be sufficient to bring them briefly back to your attention. His chief physical needs are for food and drink, clothing and shelter; his chief emotional needs are for significance, security, understanding, companionship and social approval. These have been selected as his 'chief'



needs, because they are the ones for whose satisfaction society exists.

How could they be satisfied apart from society? Consider the question a little. Water is free enough, but if we lived in a solitary state we should be sorely put to it to supply ourselves with adequate food, clothing and shelter. Imagine yourself left completely to your own resources on a reasonably fertile island in the north temperate zone. You have been ship-wrecked and cast up on the beach with hardly a rag to cover you. How would you get along? You would have no implements, no access to metals, no adequate means of clothing yourself, no cooking utensils, perhaps no way of making a fire. You would be reduced to eating berries, roots, shell-fish, and the raw flesh of such animals as you could catch. You would have only what you could *find*, and would be utterly at the mercy of your environment.

On the emotional side you would be still worse off. What significance would you have? How could you be secure

without the protection of your fellows? How could you satisfy your deep need of companionship? What progress could you make in scientific knowledge? The questions practically answer themselves. The truth of the matter is you would be reduced below the level of the lowliest savage—and you would be miserable beyond the power of words to describe.

It is through our society we are truly human; it is through the organization of society our needs are supplied. Thus, human beings are completely dependent on one another.

This statement can easily be supported—if indeed any argument is necessary to convince you. By the division and specialization of labour (mental as well as manual) we are assured of everything necessary to sustain life. Each of us does his small part, and exchanges a portion of what he produces for portions of what other people produce—either goods or services.

By organizing a government, we are made secure against ruffians and robbers, protected in our good name, and enabled to live without fear. We are guaranteed certain rights and liberties, and can—by respecting the rights and liberties of others—pursue our individual ends, and lead safe and happy lives.

By living in a social group, we achieve significance and enjoy companionship. Reasonable ego-enhancement is easily to be had. When we do something worth while, we are encouraged by the approval of our fellows; when we do something unworthy, we are corrected by their disapproval.

Almost everything we know, we have learned from society—our language, our code of morals, our skills, our esthetic tastes, our understanding and control of natural forces. Apart from society we should have none of these: we should lead wretched, starved, and hunted lives; and remain speechless, undeveloped beings to the end of our days.

There seems little reason for pursuing so obvious an argument. Let us take it for granted, therefore, that the function of society is to satisfy needs, and go on to look at another side of the subject.

THE BONDS OF SOCIETY

Something has been said of the bonds that hold the members of a social group together—the bonds they feel as a sense of unity and solidarity. It will be of interest to examine the nature of these bonds, and to find out how they come to be. Why, for example, do Canadians have a strong sense of nationhood? What is it that binds the British Commonwealth of Nations together? Why do Americans, who spring from many racial stocks, nevertheless possess so virile a patriotism? These are broad questions that cannot be answered at once, and we shall have to approach them by easy degrees.

First of all, what is it that binds people together in a family? It is not one thing but many. There are blood-relationship; continual association; common needs and common ends; marked similarity in speech, manners, moral standards, religious beliefs, traditions, customs, and tastes. The members of a family tend to have the same outlook, the same pattern of behaviour, and the same emotional responses. As a result they have a feeling of one-ness, and stand together in all the circumstances of life. Differ as they may from each other in a score of ways, they are bound by an almost indissoluble family tie.

In the case of a community, the same factors operate—though in a lesser degree. A certain amount of blood-relationship is still present; association is frequent; common needs and ends are still vividly recognized; there is still a great similarity in speech, manners, moral standards, religious beliefs, traditions, customs and tastes. The members

of a community, though they differ more than do the members of a family, are nevertheless very close to one another. They are quick to rally to the defence of community ways and community ideas. They uphold a common tradition and promote a common interest.

At the national level, the factors are no different. They are watered down a little by distance and the inclusion of dissimilar groups, but they still supply a powerful bond of union. National solidarity is founded upon them.

Let us take Canada as an illustration, and examine the bases of nationality in some detail.

1. *Blood-relationship.* In Canada there are two predominant racial stocks, and many smaller groups of different origin. People of British blood and people of French blood form the vast bulk of the population, and throughout the country are groups of Scandinavians, Italians, Ukrainians, Mennonites, Doukhobors, and others. Canada is a country still in process of *assimilating* its people. It is by assimilation of course, that blood-relationship is established. In the meantime—and perhaps this will be so for many years to come—there is great racial diversity, with the result that the bond between the various groups is not so strong as it is among a racially homogeneous people. Yet it is very strong within the groups, and there is a reasonable hope that at some distant day complete assimilation will occur.

2. *Continual Association.* Canada is a huge country, broken up into five distinct geographical units, and intimate contact between inhabitants of its various parts is rendered difficult. There are, however, some factors that make for closer and more continual association. First, transportation—especially by air—is yearly becoming more speedy and more widely available. Second, the C.B.C. networks make Canadians far better acquainted with each other. Third, many Canadian newspapers, magazines, and books are read

everywhere in the country. Fourth, professional and business associations and labour unions link Canadian people together from Nova Scotia to British Columbia. This fourth is of vital and growing importance. Fifth, movement of troops during the war has brought great numbers of men and women into personal contact with their fellow-citizens in other parts of Canada.

3. *Common Needs and Common Ends.* It is only natural that people who live in the same country should have a great many problems in common. In Canada—a comparatively new country—there were vast tracts of land to be opened up, rich resources to be developed, stern climatic difficulties to be overcome. Systems of communication and transportation were imperative needs; power had to be produced; industries had to be started and maintained; trade had to be initiated and extended. Needless to say, all these processes are still going on—scores of common problems are still to be solved. Recognition of these common problems, and of many others—together with the fact that all Canadians must co-operate in their solution—is a bond of enormous strength.

4. *Similarity of Speech.* In this respect, as in the case of blood-relationship, Canada is at some disadvantage. Two languages are widely spoken, and a number of others have a limited use. The great majority of Canadians are not bilingual: those in Quebec chiefly speak French; and those in other provinces chiefly speak English. Other language groups are comparatively small, and tend in course of time to become smaller.

The result, as might be expected, is a certain weakening of the national bond. Difference in language, since it breaks the line of communication, has a tendency to cut Canadians off from one another, and to maintain two homogeneous groups within the country instead of one. Complete unity

must await the solution of this problem. This, however, is not to say Canada is now in any degree disunited—it is only to say her sense of nationhood is due more to other factors than to language. Yet even when the latter point is admitted, French is a unifying force in Quebec, and English is a unifying force in the other provinces.

5. *Manners.* Manners are reasonably standardized over the length and breadth of Canada. There may be considerable variations when small racial groups are taken into account; but for the most part Canadians, from Halifax to Victoria, have the same ideas about courtesy and the same ways of showing it.

6. *Moral Standards.* These are identical among the great majority of Canadians, no matter what their racial origin. What is regarded as criminal or dishonest or questionable in Quebec, is regarded in much the same light in Ontario. Canadians would be rather unanimous in their judgment of any particular piece of behaviour—their approval or disapproval would vary very little from one section of the country to another. There are, of course, small racial or religious groups whose moral outlook is different in some matters, but on most questions of importance their attitude would be the same.

7. *Religious Beliefs.* Canada is a Christian country, and to that extent religion strengthens her bond of nationhood. Beyond that statement it is difficult to go. As in the case of racial origin and language, religion tends in Canada to produce two larger and a number of lesser homogeneous groups, and cannot be listed as a strongly unifying factor.

8. *Traditions.* By traditions are meant those elements of the racial history and culture, transmitted from the past, that powerfully influence the minds and hearts of succeeding generations.

What then do we find when we look at Canada? Far more

than a first glance might indicate. We find that a Canadian tradition genuinely exists and is in steady process of development. It is a real and growing bond. There have been many great and noble figures in the history of Canada and their achievements are our common heritage. We look upon them in a spirit of national pride and emulation. The bold explorers, the adventurers into perilous far-off places, the sturdy pioneers and settlers, the wise leaders—Canada has been rich in these through all her generations. She has a legion of immortal names to stir the blood and mould the character of her people. The devoted Champlain, the gallant Frontenac, the dauntless Wolfe, the resolute Mackenzie—who would not glory in such men?

Perhaps it will be a good thing to recount here—all too briefly—two of the matchless exploits that bring lustre to the Canadian story. This will not be the first time you have read them, and assuredly it will not be the last, for stories like these kindle the heart and exalt the spirit.

Far back in the early days of Canada, when the settlements were still weak and menaced by savage enemies, the news came that an overwhelming force of Iroquois was about to descend upon Montreal and Quebec. In this desperate moment, sixteen young men, led by Adam Daulac, determined with magnificent valour to give their lives in order to delay the Iroquois advance.

They journeyed up the Ottawa and established themselves, along with a few Indian allies whom they met on the way, in a broken-down stockade at the Long Sault rapids.

They did not have long to prepare their defences. Almost immediately two hundred Iroquois, the vanguard of a vastly greater expedition, engaged them in ruthless battle. For a week Daulac and his comrades beat them off with slaughter; but at the end of that time the main body of

seven hundred Iroquois arrived at the Long Sault and threw an added fury into the siege.

For three days more the gallant band held out. Deserted by all but a few of their Indian allies, beset day and night on all sides, racked with hunger and thirst, exhausted by fatigue and fainting from loss of blood, they fought on till only five mortally wounded men remained alive. The heroes perished but the settlements were saved.

It is as glorious an exploit as that of Leonidas and his three hundred Spartans in the Pass of Thermopylae—as shining in patriotism and as splendid in bravery.

The second story is that of Jean-Baptiste Lajimonière, a voyageur of the Red River, who carried a letter from Fort Douglas to Montreal in the depth of winter and through a hostile country. This is a deed that staggers the imagination—a deed that outdoes even that of Pheidippides who bore the news of victory from Marathon to Athens.

Lajimonière set out at the beginning of November through one of the most desolate stretches of country on the face of the earth, and after a journey of over two thousand miles reached Montreal on Christmas Eve. He braved hunger, fatigue and pitiless cold, the deadly hostility of the Nor' Westers through whose territory he passed, and the peril of unfriendly Indians. He struggled on, day after day, through snow and icy flood, finding what food he might and often subsisting precariously on the moss he was able to scratch from the rocks. It was an epic journey—a journey made with unbelievable resolution, against all the forces of nature and all the resources of man.

On the twenty-fourth day of December, Lajimonière dragged his weary body into the city of Montreal, and delivered his letter of urgent warning into Lord Selkirk's hands.

In the face of such stories as these, can anyone doubt the

existence of a great Canadian tradition? And the story of Canada is still unfolding. In recent times Grenfell and Banting have blazed a path to enduring fame, and Canadian airmen, soldiers and sailors have twice written their names on the pages of heroic history. The traditions grow and steadily enrich; they bind the hearts of all Canadians together. More than this. The day is surely coming when the traditions of the diverse peoples of Canada will be fused into a common heritage.

9. *Customs.* The Canadian 'way of life' is much the same throughout the country. Fundamentally, it is the democratic way of life, and it is notable for the absence of class distinctions. In Canada, 'Jack is as good as his master'. The people everywhere have a relatively high standard of living—certainly high as compared with that of many other countries. They wear the same sort of clothing, eat the same sort of food, share in the same amusements, work under the same conditions, enjoy the same days of rest, and celebrate the same anniversaries.

Divergent customs are, of course, to be found. The French-speaking, predominantly Catholic people of Quebec, and the English-speaking predominantly Protestant people of other provinces have certain customs that are peculiarly their own. The same is true of such community groups as the Mennonites and Doukhobors. But beyond these divergencies is a great body of common usage—a vast accumulation of customs common to the whole Canadian people.

10. *Taste.* Though a good beginning has been made, there is not yet what can be called a typically Canadian literature. Nor is there a typically Canadian music. Perhaps in the latter case, the lack of Canadian folk-songs will always be a severe handicap. In painting, however, there is a different story to tell. Canadian painters, inspired by the Group of Seven, have developed a typically Canadian

art, and have filled their canvases with the vivid colours, the varied landscapes, the vastness and the majesty of their native land.

It would be idle to say all Canadians have been affected by these artistic achievements, but there would be truth in the statement that the influence they exert on the Canadian people is yearly increasing.

But you must not suppose that the standards of taste in any nation are derived only from the literature, music and art of that nation itself. Artistic productions cannot be enclosed by national boundary lines—especially today, when the radio and printing press are so universally active. Also, artistic tastes, however national they may have been in the first place, are diffused by emigration and travel. It is no longer possible for any country to isolate itself from the artistic life of the world.

In Canada, this fact is clearly seen. The tides of immigration have carried in people of many different cultures. These people—English, French, Scottish, Irish, Welsh, Scandinavian, Teutonic, Central European and Latin—have brought with them the tastes and standards of the countries from which they came. As a result, the artistic outlook of Canada is a composite—a slowly developing pattern into which many diverse threads are being woven. The pattern has already taken form, and is no small factor in Canadian unity.

BONDS UNITING THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS

We have now found an answer to the question: "Why do Canadians have a strong sense of nationhood?" The answer is by no means complete and final, but it has directed your thinking along sound lines. You will realize that the question: "Why do Americans, who spring from many racial stocks, nevertheless possess so virile a patriotism?" has been

answered too. Indeed, the unity of any national group is based upon the ten factors we have examined.

There was a third question, however, namely: "What is it that binds the British Commonwealth of Nations together?" It will be worth while to find a rather definite answer to this.

First of all, let us look at the term 'British Empire'. Much objection has been taken to this term by people who do not understand it. The word 'Empire', as used here, has completely changed in meaning. Where in the past it meant the domination and exploitation of conquered or subordinate peoples by a powerful central authority, it now means—when joined to the word 'British'—a group of nations, either wholly free or developing toward freedom, bound together by ties of mutual regard, trust and interest. To attach the old meaning to 'British Empire' is either to be ignorant or to be wilfully slanderous.

Now, having cleared away one great cause of misunderstanding, let us go on to a more detailed analysis. The British Empire consists of two parts, one of which—the self-governing Dominions along with Great Britain — is usually described as the British Commonwealth of Nations, but is nowadays often referred to as "The Commonwealth". The other part—of which Sierra Leone, Mauritius, and Jamaica are illustrative—is composed of peoples not yet sufficiently developed in the social and political sense to be wholly responsible for their own government. In the natural course of events, these latter peoples will one day take their place among the self-governing Dominions, a process that is in evidence today.

We can now return to the question: "What is it that binds the British Commonwealth of Nations together?" Or to put it more definitely, why do Great Britain, Canada, Australia,

New Zealand and South Africa hold fast to one another and support one another as they do?

Of one thing you may be very sure at the outset: there is no shadow of coercion. Each Dominion is free to declare its total independence tomorrow. Note this point particularly. If you want proof, you will find it in the Statute of Westminster, effective on December 12, 1931, which, in part, reads as follows:

"No law hereafter made by the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall extend to any of the Dominions as part of the law of that Dominion . . . No law, and no provision of any law, made after the commencement of this Act by the Parliament of a Dominion shall be void or inoperative on the grounds that it is repugnant to the law of England, or to the provisions of any existing or future Act of Parliament, of the United Kingdom, or to any order, rule or regulation made under any such Act, and the powers of the Parliament of a Dominion shall include the power to repeal or amend any such Act, order, rule or regulation in so far as the same is part of the law of the Dominion."

The British Commonwealth of Nations, then, is not held together by force. We shall have to look deeper than that. We shall have to seek for the bond among those ten factors we already examined as the great unifiers of human society. Let us apply each of them in turn.

First, with the single exception of South Africa, the British Commonwealth states are predominantly peopled by men and women of British blood. Second, close association is achieved by unrestricted travel and ready settlement within the Commonwealth, and by continual consultation between its various leaders in all lines of endeavour. Third, common needs and common ends very decidedly exist. They concern such matters as the supply of natural resources, transportation and trade, security and defence. Fourth, the English

language is everywhere spoken, though in Canada and South Africa it does not stand alone. Fifth, manners throughout the Commonwealth are in substantial agreement. Sixth, there is no real difference in moral standards. Seventh, Christianity in its various forms is universal. Eighth, traditions are largely those of the Mother Country—with, of course, many additional ones native to the Dominions. Ninth, customs are reasonably similar. The way of life is everywhere democratic, and the standard of living is everywhere high. Tenth, there is little or no variation in general artistic taste.

There is no need to amplify this answer. It is enough to say that the British Commonwealth is a clear proof that free nations can unite without loss of freedom, and a practical demonstration of the fact that there can one day be a union between all the free nations of the earth.

And now in closing, let us note the three things we have discussed in this chapter. We have examined the *nature* of society, its *function*, and the *bonds* by which it is held together. With these three things thoroughly understood, we have laid a solid foundation for what is to follow.

CHAPTER 24


FORMS OF SOCIETY

You are well acquainted with the fact that society has taken, and still takes, many forms. Such terms as 'Autocracy', 'Oligarchy', 'Democracy', 'Dictatorship' and 'Totalitarianism' are well known to you. In this chapter we shall analyse the main forms society takes, and arrive at certain conclusions about them. But first, we must briefly survey the history of society from its beginnings to the present time, for only by doing so can we get a clear view of the whole subject.

The earliest and simplest society was the family group, out of which in course of time the clan and then the tribe were developed. During the enormously long period when this type of society flourished, and when the occupations of men were hunting, herding, rude agriculture and warfare, *kinship* was the chief bond that held people together. Inter-marriage under set rules, which varied greatly among different groups, produced a sense of tribal unity.

The single family was commonly ruled by the father—who was also priest, provider, protector and trader. The regulation of the family was within his authority, as also were all decisions—such as migration—that affected the family welfare.

When two or more family groups, united by close kinship, threw in their lot to form a clan, the elders of the various families took counsel together on all matters that had to do with the clan as a whole. The authority of this group of elders was not in any sense final, for a dissatisfied family might break away from the clan and resume its older, inde-



pendent state. Often one man, because of his greater shrewdness or because of his physical prowess, was elevated to the position of leader; but he was a leader among equals, and his powers were limited.

When two or more clans, still united by kinship—though, of course, more loosely—came together to form a tribe, there was no marked change in organization. The council of elders was much larger and the opportunities for ambitious men were much greater. Here, as in the case of the clan, leadership naturally fell into the hands of the intelligent and warlike; but again it was a limited leadership, often brief in duration, and dependent on the confidence it was able to arouse.

The next phase of social development was characterized by still larger groupings of men, and by a compactness of organization unknown among tribes. These compact group-

ings were the earlier and later kingdoms, and the bond that united them was *authority*.

As a result of warfare between clans—chiefly over such matters as the possession of fertile soil, abundant water, resources and goods—and as a result of the fact that success in large military undertakings called for single and unrestricted leadership, despotism arose. The victorious chieftain carried over his authority from war to peace, and assumed kingly powers. His lieutenants became an order of nobles. The rank and file of his tribesmen lost their ancient equality and their ancient freedom, and became the governed people. Many of the conquered became slaves. This was the origin of classes, the beginning of feudalism.

Here, you see, was authority in its starkest form. It was vested, absolutely and without recourse, in the person of a single individual. All power, all justice, and all mercy were his and his alone. The king was not only above the law, he *was* the law.

Naturally, however, when the tide of conquest swept over a vast area and involved many peoples, the personal rule of the king was made difficult. It was necessary for him to appoint a number of subordinate rulers to act for him in the different parts of his kingdom. These men levied taxes, administered justice, and raised armies in his behalf. Their importance was in proportion to their individual responsibility and power, and from them the various orders of nobility have stemmed.

As you would expect, disturbances and rebellions were frequent. The conquered peoples were turbulent, the nobles were ambitious to set up small kingdoms of their own, the king defended his authority by ruthless repression and assassination. "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown!"

There is one curious and significant point to mention—a point that brings out the inextinguishable desire of every

human being for self-justification. Even the most pitiless despot had need of this. No matter how savage his tyranny nor how cruel his personal life, he had somehow to convince himself he ruled in the best interests of the governed. Very few tyrants were completely cynical. Thus, behind the most oppressive tyranny, there existed—weak and nebulous though it might be—a sense of moral responsibility. When liberty was at its lowest ebb, a force was at work for its restoration.

The third and highest form of social organization—that found today in the most civilized and enlightened countries of the world—is cemented together by *citizenship*. We have already discussed the ten chief factors that unite men in a modern nation or group of nations. There are, however, three principles of citizenship to be particularly noted, and they may be set down as follows:

1. The individual is guaranteed in his personal significance and rights.
2. Government is a delegated authority, whose primary purpose is to preserve and defend the personal significance and rights of the individual.
3. Justice is impartially dispensed, without regard to birth, wealth, or creed.

You will see at once, we are discussing a well-developed and enlightened democracy, of which the British Commonwealth of Nations, the United States and the Scandinavian countries are the best examples in the world today. Democracy continually evolves and broadens: it is never final and complete. It is subject to endless modification as the conditions of life change—indeed, it could reach finality only in a changeless world.

One step remains to complete our survey of the history

of society, namely, the step from authority to citizenship. How did this enormous advance come about?

This advance—and we shall refer to Britain as the finest illustration—was marked by the gradual wresting of rights by the masses from a privileged ruling class. The process was continuous, and mounted inexorably in strength from at least the time of King John. The Magna Carta established the rights of the nobles against the despotic powers of the king. The Bill of Rights at the accession of William and Mary, and the Reform Bills of the nineteenth century established the rights of the people themselves.

It is worth noting that privileged classes almost never give up their privileges of their own accord; they only do so when faced with a worse alternative. "Freedom is always a conquest, never a gift." Only by the exertion of steady pressure have the British people, gradually and bloodlessly, attained to full citizenship.

A more specific example of the process taken, of course, from British history, will make the matter plain.

During the early years of the nineteenth century—due to changes wrought by the Industrial Revolution, and their effect on the distribution of wealth and population—a clash of interests arose between the privileged ruling class on the one hand and industry on the other. Up to 1832, government in Britain had been in the hands of the great landowners, most of whom were aristocrats. These people had controlled all elections to parliament, and had seen to it that members of parliament served their interests.

Now such an arrangement, objectionable as it may seem to us today, was not too unreasonable at a time when the bulk of the population was engaged in farming, and when the landowners as a class were far more educated and enlightened than their tenants and labourers.

The coming of the Industrial Revolution changed the

whole face of British Society. Factories arose wherever conditions were favourable, and thousands of people left the land for the sake of the higher wages paid to factory hands. Great new cities appeared. Men and women completely altered their way of living. Manufacture became more important than agriculture. Wealthy industrialists challenged the power of the aristocracy. Factory hands demanded votes and the right to cast them as they wished.

Slowly but surely the landowners were forced to give way. Parliamentary seats were taken away from deserted villages like Old Sarum, and given to populous cities like Manchester and Birmingham. The wealthy industrialists were admitted into the ruling class, and their employees were enfranchised.

Such, then, is the way in which authority has given place to citizenship; and with this we may say our outline of the history of society has been sketched in. Our next task will be to examine the main forms of society at each of the three levels—no very difficult undertaking.

AUTOCRACY, OLIGARCHY AND DEMOCRACY

A quite simple analysis will supply us with the method by which to proceed. There are three basic ways in which government can be conducted: by one person, by a group of people, or by all the people. The terms commonly used to signify these three basic ways are, of course: autocracy, oligarchy and democracy.

All three are found in human organization everywhere, and are by no means restricted to the government of a country. Mr. Addington, for instance, has built up a substantial business employing many men. He regards the business as his own, and controls every department personally. His subordinates are responsible to him alone. His word is law, and though he may sometimes listen to advice

he always acts according to his own judgment. The business, therefore, is of the autocratic sort.

Jones, Davidson and Crerar are a firm of wholesalers. Like Mr. Addington they are in a large way of business and give employment to many people. When decisions are to be made, they reach them by consultation among themselves. No one else has any authority. Their business is conducted on oligarchical lines.

A group of men—trained editors, reporters and printers—contribute their savings to buy a newspaper. Each man has his own interest in the venture, and has his say in all matters affecting the newspaper in general and his own department in particular. He agrees to put certain men in positions of authority, but he holds them responsible for their actions and retains the right to vote for their removal if they prove incompetent. In this third case, the organization is democratic.

Exactly the same principles apply to schools, clubs, associations, lodges, unions and societies. When one dominant individual impresses his personal will on the group, the result is autocracy; when a small clique takes full control into its own hands, the result is oligarchy; when the whole membership is active in the administration, the result is democracy.

You will note in the organizations with which you are acquainted, there tends to be a movement from one form to the other. For example, a number of boys form a tennis club. They get together to discuss ways and means. As a result of their discussions, they arrive at certain decisions and elect a committee to carry them out. The use of tennis courts is arranged, and play begins.

So far, the procedure has been thoroughly democratic. But soon it is evident that several of the boys—probably the best players—are exerting an authority much greater than

that of the others. These boys take to themselves the right of selecting teams, organizing tournaments, and drawing up schedules of play. The other boys, overawed by their superior tennis ability, allow them to establish themselves as a little ruling body. Democracy ends and oligarchy begins.

But something else may happen. One of the boys may be so dominant a personality or so brilliant a player that all the others begin to bow to his opinion. Every week his influence becomes stronger, till in the end his word is law. Then democracy or oligarchy has given way to autocracy.

These changes are fatally easy. Just a little loss of interest on the part of the group, just a little laziness or backwardness about maintaining their rights, and democracy is gone.

With this commonplace and familiar background, let us turn again to society itself. What do we find at each of the three levels? Do the principles of autocracy, oligarchy and democracy apply to the tribe, the kingdom, and the modern state?

1. *The Kinship Level.* Fundamentally the tribe was democratic, in so far as all grown men had a right to be heard in its counsels. Women had no such right, and slaves had no rights at all. Such as the democracy was, it was crude and limited. Yet the fact that grown men must be heard was a strong influence in the direction of personal liberty. Argument and persuasion could be used as well as force—the thoughtful and eloquent, as well as the aggressive and warlike, had an opportunity to sway the minds of their fellows.

The oligarchical tendency, however, was always present. Leadership tended to fall into a few hands, for men of prowess and men of wisdom were respected, and others submitted to their domination. But it should be noted that such domination was seldom permanent or complete. Where the small group of leaders began to rule in its own interest

and not in the interest of the tribe, bloodshed soon followed and other men assumed leadership.

You will see here a similarity between the government of the tribe and the government of a modern democratic state. Today we must of necessity elect men to conduct our national business, but if we find they conduct it to their own advantage and not to ours, we remove them at the next election.

The autocratic tendency was also to be found in tribal organization. Sometimes a man of unusual ability and personal force gained supreme control. This man became a chieftain and his family became a semi-royal house. He surrounded himself with a chosen bodyguard, lived in great splendour, dispensed justice, eliminated his rivals, and directed the tribe in all its activities. But two things acted as a check upon his power. First, the bond of kinship linked him closely with even the humblest member of the tribe. And second, the spirit of tribal freedom was usually strong enough to oust him if he became wholly self-seeking and tyrannical.

2. *The Authority Level.* This, you will remember, succeeded the tribal organization, since kingdoms were established as a result of conquest. Usually, warlike tribes descended upon their more wealthy and cultured neighbours and subdued them at the point of the sword. By doing so, they gained choice territories, treasure and slaves. We have already noted how kingship and the orders of nobility arose, so there is no need to repeat the story here.

In the early kingdom, you will seek for traces of democracy in vain. The king's authority was absolute. If he so desired—as he frequently did—he could pursue his own interests against those of everyone else in the kingdom. All he required was a strong and loyal feudatory army. His main fear was that some other individual might supplant him by force; and to still this fear he availed himself freely

of imprisonment, banishment, execution and assassination. In scores of instances, kings put their near relatives and even their sons to death.

Oligarchy, however, was sometimes found—usually as the result of rebellion against a particularly oppressive king. A group of nobles would band together, raise a powerful army, overthrow the king, and seize the reins of authority. But in the long run another king was set up—a king acceptable to the nobles and less powerful than his predecessor. This process, strange though the statement may seem, was in the direction of democracy, for kings were gradually shorn of their power. It was by such a process, or at least by the threat of such a process, that King John was forced to sign the Magna Carta.

There were a few cases where oligarchies remained in control for many years, but these cases occurred in the early republics. The republic of Venice was a typical illustration.

The early republics can be classified with the early kingdoms for two reasons. First, they frequently were kingdoms for considerable periods of time; and second, they rested more on authority than on citizenship. Yet when this is all said, they nevertheless foreshadowed the democracy that was to come.

The republics of Athens and Rome were the finest examples of this ancient form of social organization. In each of them there was a well-developed class system, in each of them the upper classes had far more authority than had the rank and file of the citizens, and in each of them there was a very large slave population. With all their good points, they were certainly not democracies in our sense of the term. They can with much greater accuracy be described as oligarchical.

Note now that power was seized on many occasions by ambitious individuals, who set up dictatorships or mon-

archies according to circumstances. In Rome, for example, the republic was set aside by Marius, who was followed in turn by Sulla, Pompey and Julius Caesar. Each of these men was an absolute ruler, even though the forms of republican organization were preserved. Each of them was a dictator, who ruled by force, and who was accountable to himself alone. Different though they were in many respects, in this respect they were the same.

After the period of the Dictators came the period of the Emperors, and the republic was completely supplanted. Even the appearance of democracy was gone. The Emperors, surrounded by their Praetorian Guard, strong in the might of their armies, hedged about by pomp and ceremonial, and already numbered among the gods, were possessed of a greater personal authority than had ever been wielded by mortal man.

Reference was made to the republic of Venice, and the Venetian form of organization—of which other examples are very few—deserves more than a passing note. The republic can be said to have lasted from A.D. 697, when the first Doge (or President) was elected, to 1797 when the last Doge abdicated under pressure exerted by Napoleon. During eleven hundred years the Venetian oligarchy maintained its authority.

The oligarchy was composed of certain wealthy patrician families who held political control in their own hands. They denied any real citizenship to the masses of the people, and themselves filled all the offices of state, including that of Doge. In spite of many ups and downs, the oligarchs were successful.

There were, of course, some special reasons for their success. Venice was immensely strong in defence, being almost inaccessible to enemies either by land or by sea. She was also a great trading power, and immensely rich. Her defences

protected her against interference from without, and the absence of poverty among her people safeguarded her against serious disturbances from within. It is true the oligarchy ruled chiefly in its own interest, but in doing so it served the interests of the inhabitants at large.

A word about what have been called the 'later' kingdoms. Typical of these were France before the Revolution and Great Britain before the accession of William and Mary. In France an absolute monarchy prevailed, and had most of the features already described as those of the 'earlier' kingdoms. In Great Britain, matters were very different: even in the Tudor period the sovereign had been compelled to extend the rights of the people, and particularly of the merchant class; and during the Stuart régime, parliament had successfully challenged the royal authority. Thus, when William and Mary ascended the throne, they were faced by a determined populace who insisted on retaining every right and liberty wrested from the Stuart kings.

The result was a Limited Monarchy—a monarchy that still exercised great powers, but could in no circumstances go beyond the limits set by the constitution and the parliament. Here you can plainly see the merging of the principle of authority into the principle of citizenship. Bit by bit, the king's 'authority' was reduced to the king's 'influence', and parliament assumed ever-increasing control.

3. *The Citizenship Level.* We come now to the modern state. Although it is true—as we have seen—that citizenship is by no means a new idea, yet only in the modern state has it reached full and reasonably stable development. It is based on the constitutional rights of the individual, and extends over all the people. It is exercised through elected representatives, over whom the citizens have a very large measure of control.

It is obvious that citizenship is possible only in the demo-

cratic type of organization. The significance of the individual, his liberties and rights, his ultimate authority over his leaders—these are its essential characteristics. In the British Commonwealth of Nations, in the United States and in the Scandinavian countries, it is found in its finest, and most highly developed form. Not, mark you, that our democracy is perfect or our citizenship flawless! To say so would be to suggest that progress had come to an end. But no one can truthfully deny that the democracy and citizenship we now possess are the most excellent the world has yet seen.

Nevertheless, the oligarchical and autocratic tendencies are still to be found. From time to time a small group with special interests—chiefly political or economic—attempts by various methods to impress its will on the nation as a whole; and sometimes, as in Germany and Italy and certain South American republics, a single individual sweeps away the constitution and rules according to his own brutal pleasure. Totalitarianism is no mere flight of fancy.

There is no final safety for us. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. There will always be men and groups of men who, to satisfy their own selfish desires and ambitions, will be ready to filch away our freedom. If we take democracy for granted, if we cease to cherish and defend it with resolute zeal, there may come a day when citizenship will be destroyed.

THE LIMITED MONARCHY AND THE REPUBLIC

You will note there are two forms of democracy today: the Limited Monarchy in which the king is symbolic of all that characterizes the state and the citizen body; and the Republic, in which the symbol of kingship no longer exists. Both forms are substantially the same. In each of them the

people exercise complete authority over their affairs, and enjoy rights guaranteed by the state.

Let us briefly examine these two forms, taking for examples the British Commonwealth and the United States. Kingship among the British people is both traditional and useful. The king's power is nominal only, his veto is never exercised. Only through his influence over his ministers—an influence proportional to his good judgment as a man—does he affect state policy. The parliament in each Dominion is supreme, and within his own country each prime minister wields much of the old kingly authority.

What then is the value of the king? The answer is easily given. In his person he symbolizes the people over whom he nominally rules, their virtues and their national character. He is a rallying point, a human focus for the patriotic emotions of British men and women throughout the world. Being beyond politics and all controversy, he represents all his people. He is the British Commonwealth of Nations concentrated in the person of a single man.

The Republican form, from which kingship has, of course, been eliminated, is more democratic in appearance, though no more so in reality, than the Limited Monarchy. An elected president takes the place of a king. In the United States, the president is the leader of a great political party and is naturally involved in party platforms and campaigns. He wields vast powers and, when supported by a friendly Congress, practically rules the country. As you know, there is a presidential election every fourth year, so the president can be returned or removed as the people decide.

In France (under normal conditions) and in Russia, the president is not a powerful political figure. The real power is in the hands of the prime minister (by whatever name known) and the elected representatives of the people. As in

the case of the United States, the president has a limited term of office.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

We have now considered the chief forms of social organization so far as individual states are concerned. In order to complete the analysis, we must inquire briefly into the larger question of international relationships. In what ways has mankind as a whole attempted to organize the world for peace and justice? What form is world organization now taking?

There are a few points to be noted first, and for the sake of clearness they will be set down in order. They represent conditions prior to the formulating of the Charter of the United Nations in 1945.

1. Each national state is sovereign and free. It claims a complete and absolute control of its own affairs.

2. Agreements between states are not binding, except so far as the national honour of the contracting parties will support them.

3. Penalties against states are exceedingly hard to enforce. A state may break an agreement on grounds of national expediency, and escape without punishment.

4. International Law is therefore an appearance rather than a reality.

5. The League of Nations in its original form—in which several nations, including the United States, refused to be included, and from which any nation might resign at pleasure—was a body without sufficient authority to assure peace and justice to the world.

Such was the state of affairs before the great Conference of the United Nations at San Francisco. At that Conference a charter was agreed upon, and the promise of world co-operation and peace was solemnly given. Unlike the League

of Nations, the United Nations have been vested with the authority to enforce the rule of peace and justice against all aggressors.

For your information, here are a few excerpts from the Charter. More detail is not required, as the Charter itself is readily available and should be studied as a whole by everyone who claims to be an enlightened person.

Article I of the Charter

The Purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.

3. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

Article XLII of the Charter

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article XLI (Economic Sanctions)

would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, and land forces of members of the United Nations.

Excerpts from the statute of the International Court of Justice:

Article I

The International Court of Justice established by the Charter of the United Nations as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations shall be constituted and shall function in accordance with the provisions of the present Statute.

Article II

The Court shall be composed of a body of independent judges, elected regardless of their nationality from among persons of high moral character, who possess the qualifications required in their respective countries for appointment to the highest judicial offices, or are juris-consults of recognized competence in international law.

Article XXXVI (in part)

1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force.

2. The states parties to the present Statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any

other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

- (a) the interpretation of a treaty;
- (b) any question of international law;
- (c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
- (d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

CHAPTER 25

INSTITUTIONS

THE term 'institution', as generally used, has two rather different meanings, one of which does not concern us here. In order to avoid all misunderstandings, it seems wise to set both these meanings clearly down. First, an institution may be defined as a rather permanent social organization through which a group of people achieves a common end. Good illustrations are the family, the school, and the church. Second, an institution may be defined as the building or buildings used for some rather permanent social purpose. Illustrations in this case would be a hospital plant, or the high-walled structure of a penitentiary. In this chapter, we shall be interested only in the first meaning, and shall always use the word 'institution' in that sense.

An institution, then, is an established pattern of ways in which human beings act in order to satisfy certain needs they have in common. The function of society itself, you will recall, is to serve the reasonable needs of its members. Needs, however, are so numerous and so diversified that the function of society has to be simplified and specialized. Thus institutions have arisen, each of which serves certain needs and not others. Only when all institutions are taken together are all needs seen to be served.

We are now in a position to analyse and discuss the definition with which the last paragraph began. By doing this we shall have firm ground under our feet, and shall be able to go safely on to the fuller discussion that is to follow.

Note first, an institution is intended to satisfy certain

definite needs. If it ceases to do so it is soon swept aside as useless. The school satisfies educational needs, the church satisfies religious needs, business and industry satisfy economic needs, a tennis club satisfies recreational needs, and so on. Each of them has its own particular field, though of course there is a good deal of overlapping.

Second, an institution is operated and directed by human beings. Apart from human beings it has no existence. The success or failure of an institution depends on the efficiency or stupidity with which these human beings use it to satisfy the needs it is intended to serve.

Third, an institution is a pattern of action. It is a set of standardized ways in which people go about the satisfaction of certain definite needs.

Fourth, an institution has great permanence. Its pattern of action has usually been established through long social experience, and it is handed on by each generation to the next.

The point is really very simple. Here is a need common to a number of people. They endeavour to satisfy the need, and after a while the best ways of doing so are found. These ways are used over and over again with success, and at last are firmly established. They are passed on from father to son, and become a standard pattern of action—in other words, an institution.

To illustrate, people from the earliest times have wanted to perfect themselves in public speech. At the beginning there was no organization for this purpose, and no doubt there was a long period of trial and error before people found out what to do. Experience finally produced the debating society, with its chairman, its constitution, and its rules of procedure. The debating society, because it successfully served a very general need, became the standard

pattern of action among those who wished to be public speakers. Today it can be classed as a minor institution.

This illustration leads us to the next question. What is meant by a 'minor' institution? Are some institutions more important than others?

Institutions have been created to serve definite needs. It stands to reason that those serving fundamental and universal needs are more important than those serving needs of a special and less general sort. A need common to everybody, and whose satisfaction is essential to everybody, must naturally confer immense importance on the institution that serves it. A need felt by few people, and not vital even to them, can scarcely give rise to anything more than a minor institution.

Thus institutions vary in significance according to the needs they serve. At the upper end of the scale are the family, the state, the school, the church, health service, the courts, and those commercial and industrial organizations that minister to our physical wants. Somewhere in the middle are the press, the radio, the theatre, and organizations for the production of art and music. At the lower end are all manner of associations, societies and clubs that satisfy special needs and afford pleasure to limited groups. Major institutions are very few indeed; minor institutions are numerous as the sands of the sea.

Historically speaking, all institutions have arisen, as a result of specialization, from the family. All the needs they serve were originally served by the family. As the family group was merged in the clan, the tribe, the kingdom, and finally in the modern state, it declined from its early importance and lost many of its early functions. Other institutions came into existence to do much of what it had formerly done. The state took over the protection of life and property; the school (after the invention of writing) undertook

the responsibility of educating the young; the church assumed control of things religious; a profession of healers concerned itself with care of the body; courts were set up to administer justice; business and industry were organized to look after the economic side. And along with these, thousands of lesser institutions sprang up to serve lesser needs.

From what has so far been said, you might perhaps be under the impression that institutions are ageless and changeless—which would be a grievous mistake. They change slowly but inexorably. As needs change and as the means of satisfying them change, institutions cannot help but be modified.

Mention has already been made of the profound modification, though over many ages, of the family. From being the sole institution, responsible for the satisfaction of every reasonable human need, it has become just one among the major institutions that compose modern society, and its functions have been limited and reduced in number.

In our discussion of the forms of society, you saw how the institution of government has undergone modification throughout its history. You saw how a type of organization well suited to regulate and protect a primitive society of hunters had to be modified over and over again as men turned from hunting to herding, from herding to agriculture, and from agriculture to manufacture and trade.

The fundamental needs of man are the same as ever, but many new ones are continually being added. There is an old saying that the luxuries of today are the needs of tomorrow. Not only do needs become more numerous and varied, but so also do resources. Science is forever placing new materials and new powers at man's disposal, and modern transportation brings the goods of the whole world to his doorstep. Thus man's needs and his means of satisfying

them are progressively extended. Moreover, man now lives no longer in tiny groups, but in vast national and even international communities. It is little wonder that the ways in which needs were formerly satisfied—the institutions of yesterday—are inadequate to the conditions of today. Every institution, from the greatest to the least, must, if it is to remain efficient, be continually modified according to the demands of our changing world.

Having now discussed institutions in general, let us proceed to consider the major institutions in particular. In each case three questions should be answered: What needs does the institution serve? How has it been modified? What future modifications are probable?

1. THE FAMILY

The family, as you know, can be called the mother of institutions, because there was an early period when the family was one and the same thing with society itself. All our institutions have branched out from this original stem.

At the dawn of human time, the family served every human need, but today its function has become much more limited. The chief needs served by it in modern society are these:

- (a) Intimate, sympathetic and easy companionship.
- (b) Mating and race-perpetuation,
- (c) Nurture and education of children.

To begin with the matter of companionship, we have here the closest human bond of all. Members of a family are bound together by common interests that extend over the whole range of their lives. They share the same home, eat the same food, discuss the same subjects, face the same economic problems, feel the same emotions, and develop the same attitudes. Even when they differ from one another



in many respects, they are united by a sympathy and understanding that no outsider can approach.

Many a time you have seen this. Two sisters may be critical of each other in a score of ways. They may seem antagonistic and a little unkind. But let one of them be criticized by someone else, and the other will rally at once to her support—let one of them meet with misfortune, and the other will immediately respond with tenderness and help.

This, however, is not all. The family provides a place of refuge, a little haven from the storms of competitive life. It is essentially a restful place, where it is possible to be natural without being misunderstood, where tensions can be relaxed, and where the mind can be at ease. That beautiful phrase, 'the bosom of one's family', is expressive of our purest joys and our sweetest consolations.

Of mating and race-perpetuation little need be said. In all ages and in every society, marriage has been held in high honour. It has been given an almost sacred character, and has been supported by the whole weight of group opinion. No matter how it has been brought about—by capture, purchase or consent—and no matter what its form, whether monogamous or polygamous, it has always been regarded as the great corner-stone of the social fabric.

The third function, nurture and education of children, also calls for little discussion. The utter helplessness of the human child has already been discussed. The need for nurture is self-evident.

But it is perhaps not so evident that education is a function of the family. We are so used to thinking of the school as the sole educational institution, there is some danger we fail to realize that other institutions share in this vitally essential task. Indeed, it is true to say that every institution is educative within its own field.

Consider the education given by the family. During the first half-dozen years of a child's life—his most impressionable years—he is instructed in language, in manners and morals, in all manner of important skills, and in many simple branches of knowledge. After he goes to school, and as long as he remains in the family circle, the educative process continues. He learns to see the world from the family point of view, to acquire the family tastes, to take on the family character. The family sets its seal upon him, and makes him a Smith, a Jones or a Robinson in fact as well as in name.

The fundamental modification of the family throughout the ages has already been considered. There are however, some lesser modifications at which we should glance. Chief among them are changes in marriage.

The monogamous marriage of today has by no means

always been the rule—among many peoples and for long periods of time, polygamy has flourished. The moral standards of primitive agricultural and pastoral peoples definitely favoured the marriage of one man to several women. Many workers were necessary, and the man with many wives and children was much more likely to prosper. Exactly the opposite situation occurred among certain nomadic peoples. Due to the scarcity of good grazing land and to the exhausting migrations that resulted, many girl babies were put to death as serious handicaps to the survival of the tribe. Thus men were far more numerous than women, and the moral code of such peoples favoured the marriage of one woman to several men.

Even monogamous marriage is changing. Divorce laws are much less stringent than they were, and there is a tendency for marriage to be looked on as a civil contract that may be cancelled almost at the will of the contracting parties. There is a great deal to be said against this tendency. First, marriage calls for a long series of difficult adjustments, and frequently does not settle into a fully harmonious and understanding relationship until several years have passed. Easy divorce makes people less willing to endure the discomforts of this preparatory period. Second, children are apt to meet disaster when their home is broken. They lack the steadying influence of normal family life and are more likely to become delinquent. Third, easy divorce spells easy re-marriage, and the whole fabric of morality is shaken.

One more change may be noted. The modern abundance of commercialized entertainment has struck a heavy blow at the unity of the home. There is far less home life than there used to be. Do you think this is a good state of affairs? If not, what suggestions would you offer to make things better? Here are a few for your consideration: A well-

equipped recreation room in the basement; a work-bench provided with tools and materials; a small laboratory; a tennis or badminton court in the garden; frequent use of the piano for informal parties; a debating or other club visiting each home in turn; a good library of old and modern books; a selection of records, both classical and popular. Naturally enough, no ordinary home can provide all these facilities—nor should it try to do so—but most homes could improve greatly on what they are now providing. A little ingenuity would work wonders.

THE STATE

By the state is meant the organization of the people as a whole—the supreme institution, under whose general authority all other institutions come.

In discussing the state, there is a point you must particularly note at the outset. Two very antagonistic theories of the state have been widely held. One is that the state exists to serve the individuals who compose it; and the other is that individuals exist to serve the state. The first of these theories underlies democracy; the second underlies totalitarianism.

There can be no question about the view taken in this book. We have regarded all institutions as established ways in which men and women satisfy their common and reasonable needs—and the state itself is no exception. Organizations serve people, and not vice versa. It would be strange indeed if people existed to serve organizations!

Let us take a simple case and examine it. We will say that you and several of your friends have become very interested in amateur acting, and decide to form a little dramatic club. Clearly this is something that calls for a great deal of co-operation. One of the group has a large basement in which a stage can be put up; another knows a good deal

about electric lighting; a third has artistic ability and can improvise sets. And so on. Each member contributes his or her effort and talent, and very soon the club is in a flourishing condition.

Now, it is clear that the members owe *each other* their loyalty and support. If they fail in these respects, the club will collapse and the needs it serves will cease to be satisfied. But does this mean the club itself—the organization—has any existence and authority apart from its members? Surely the club is merely a means to the end that certain individuals shall obtain the enjoyment they desire. When these individuals lose interest in amateur acting, the club is ended.

Exactly the same principle holds good in the case of any institution, major or minor. The difference lies in the fact that major institutions—of which the state is one—serve permanent and universal needs. They are therefore more enduring and less easily modified. But to say that individuals exist in order to support *them* is to put the cart before the horse. The state, therefore, is our servant, not our master. Its authority comes, not from itself at all, but from the basic and obvious truth that we must be loyal to *one another*. And this is the essence of democracy.

We come now to the question: What needs does the state serve? It is not an easy question to answer, and there is a good deal of dispute about details, but the main functions of the state can be set down. Here are four for your consideration:

- (a) Maintaining the security of life, property and reputation.
- (b) Regulating relationships between individuals and between groups.
- (c) Carrying on undertakings essential to the well-being of all.
- (d) Dealing with other countries.

Self-evident though these four functions of the state are, it will be a good thing to look at each of them rather carefully. As a citizen you must be very clear as to what membership of the state means.

First, the state maintains the security of our life, property and reputation. It needs no argument to show you that without these fundamental securities no organized life is possible. Where the weak are at the mercy of the strong, where robbers may take what they will, and where a good name can be blasted without fear of punishment, there is simply no society.

It is therefore a primary function of the state to provide conditions of law and order, to make life, property and reputation safe. There has never been a state in which these things were not, at least to some extent, done. In our modern democracy they are done very well indeed. Murder is a rarity; assault is infrequent; robbery is severely penalized; reputation is protected by laws against slander and libel. It may be said that one of the great marks of progress in civilization is the increasing safety of individual life.

Second, the state regulates relationships between individuals and between groups. This function is just a refinement of the first. The modern state includes many millions of people, whose manner of life has become extremely complex, and whose interests frequently clash. It has, therefore, become necessary to pass and enforce laws that regulate relationships in great detail. Under modern conditions, fraud and rascality can take a thousand forms undreamed of in primitive communities.

It is worth noting here that liberty depends on a certain amount of restriction. If there were no laws, there would certainly be no liberty for the weak. In order to live in a society, individuals must be prevented from behaving in ways that take away the reasonable liberties of others. So



the state must clearly define the point at which one man's liberty becomes another man's loss of liberty; and this means some restriction for all. The matter will be discussed more fully in Chapter 27.

Third, the state must carry on some undertakings essential to the well-being of all. There is, as you know, much debate as to what is implied by this function. It will be sufficient here to mention a few state undertakings on which all men substantially agree.

The state must organize and control the army, navy and air force. It must have oversight of all establishments that maintain law and order within the country. It must control currency and taxation. It must conduct the postal service. It must have authority over sanitation and health. It must build roads. It must conserve natural resources. It must encourage trade. In time of war it must enter the field of

production, so that the nation will be provided with munitions and supplies.

Fourth, the state must deal with other countries. This, of course, is done through the Department of Foreign Affairs and the diplomatic service. The nation must speak with one voice in its international relations, and that voice must issue from the state itself. Any other arrangement would lead to endless and hopeless disputes.

Such, then, are the main functions of the state. It only remains to glance for a moment at the question of their modification in the past and their probable modification in the future. Regarding the past, it is easy enough to see how the institution known as the state has changed. Although the needs it serves have been fundamentally much the same from the beginning of human time, they have continually been modified according to the changing conditions of life. In tribal days, for example, many things done by the modern state were wholly unnecessary—even unheard of in that society.

Regarding the future, we may safely assume that changes will continue to occur. What they will be, no man knows. The trend, however, is to a broader democracy, in which the state will set more deliberately out to serve all the reasonable needs of all the people. It will be more humanitarian in spirit, more and more concerned with the welfare of the individual citizen.

THE SCHOOL

Here is an institution with which you are very well acquainted! Ever since the invention of writing, it has flourished among men. It is found everywhere above the level of the savage, and serves needs of the most general and basic sort.

Before going on to discuss its function, we must turn

aside for a moment to make a distinction between schooling and education. There are many people who do not distinguish one from the other, and who come as a result to some very erroneous conclusions.

[Education is a process that continues from the cradle to the grave; schooling is confined to the early years of life. Schooling is only a part—though a most important part—of education. Much education is incidental and unplanned. Schooling is very carefully planned. It is possible for a man without schooling to become highly educated, but such an outcome is exceedingly rare; and it is also possible for schooling to result in no worth-while education at all—which unfortunately is not so rare.

The sole function of the school is to develop the child into a cultured citizen of the state in which he lives. In a democracy, therefore, the development is along these four lines:

(a) *Knowledge*. The child must be put in possession—through actual and direct participation wherever possible—of the facts and principles by which civilized man directs his society and controls his physical environment.

(b) *Skills*. The child must acquire—this time entirely through actual and direct participation—all the skills necessary to his general efficiency. If he is not to remain helpless or handless when faced by ordinary situations, he must be able to handle common tools and common equipment with reasonable ease.

(c) *Social Grace*. The child must learn to get along with other people, to co-operate effectively, and to do his full share of work. He must develop good speech, pleasant manners and an upright character. He must become well poised and acceptable in all his social relationships.

(d) *Good Taste*. The child must develop standards of good taste in literature, music and art.

Such, in very brief and partial outline, is the function of the school. As was said before, every institution is educative in its own field and assists in the business of producing cultured citizens. But the school is the only institution set up for that purpose alone.

The school has undergone, and will continue to undergo, endless modifications. For one thing, it is always an instrument of the state it serves, and develops citizens suited to the character and conditions of life in that state—the German school turned out Nazis with no difficulty at all. For another thing, knowledge grows, skills change, social behaviour alters and artistic tastes are modified—and the school must keep pace with its society.

THE CHURCH

Religious organizations among men have been, and still remain, very many and varied. The subject of religion is a thorny one, as you are well aware; so we will content ourselves with noting what the fundamental needs served by this institution are.

You will recall among the basic needs of the human being, these four: significance, security, companionship and understanding. Note how they are served by the religious institution.

(a) Religion adds enormously to the significance of the individual in these ways. It emphasizes God's concern for him, and his equality with all other men in the eyes of God.

(b) Religion heightens the sense of security by strengthening man's faith in an after-life. He feels that, come what may, he will not be blotted out, and that his misfortunes of today are as nothing beside the promise of tomorrow.

(c) Religion gives man a companionship when earthly companionships fail. He can go to God for consolations

nowhere else to be found. He has a sense of support in the saddest and loneliest moments of his life.

(d) Religion affords an explanation of mysteries beyond the range of science. It answers the questions: Why are we here? and, What will happen to us after we die? which are questions every man asks, and only religion can answer.

HEALTH SERVICE

This institution is very diversified, and includes the professions of medicine, nursing, dentistry, and drug-dispensing. It also includes hospitals, water supply and sanitation, welfare organizations, and physical training agencies of all sorts. Indeed, health is such a primary concern in modern society, it would be difficult even to list the numerous branches of the institution that serves it.

Many changes have occurred in the institution during quite modern times, and have been due almost entirely to the progress of science. New drugs, new instruments, new techniques, new understanding of many diseases, new preventive methods, new discoveries in dietetics—these are the causes of change. The basic need for health is unchanging, but the ways in which that need is satisfied are different in many particulars even from one year to the next. If, indeed, you were to compare mediaeval medical practice with that of today, you would have difficulty in believing they occurred in the same world, let alone that they were phases of the same institution.

It takes no prophet to realize that the process will continue. Science marches steadily on, general health steadily improves, and the day may come when every disease to which we are now subject will be eliminated or controlled.

THE COURTS

The administration of justice—with which are associated all organizations for the prevention and punishment of

crime—is really a function of the state. It is such an important function, however, that it can well rank as a separate major institution.

As you know, criminology has become a science in itself. It includes many branches that would make the mediaeval judge open his eyes in blank amazement. Crime detection, for example, requires not only a knowledge of psychology, but also a knowledge of chemistry, ballistics, finger-printing and anatomical measurements. The matter of punishment and its results has been scientifically studied. There is scarcely a science that does not throw some light on the problems of crime.

Undoubtedly the administration of justice will continue to change as science advances. In fact, it will have to do so—if for no other reason than because the criminal makes quick use of every new discovery. It is highly improbable that crime will ever cease to exist, but as prevention becomes better understood, detection more certain, and punishment more effective, it may cease to pay. And that is something to which we may look forward with reasonable hope.

INDUSTRY AND BUSINESS

This is the most extensive and complex institution of all, including as it does the whole economic structure. Its function is to supply not only all our physical needs but also every other need that depends on goods and services. Its effect is felt in every department of human life.

Consider the point a little. It is obvious we rely on industry and business for food, clothing and shelter. What is not quite so obvious is that we rely on them for a great deal that makes every one of our pursuits possible. Schools, churches, hospitals, the arts and recreation all require equipment, and that equipment is furnished by industry and business.

The point, of course, is that nothing can be produced without work, that only through work can most of our needs be satisfied. This institution, therefore, since it is concerned with at least ninety-five per cent of the work done in the world, must be fundamental to our very existence.

Here also science has played the great part. Scientific progress is more quickly and more powerfully felt in this institution than in any other. Change is rapid and widespread—hardly anything remains the same for five years on end. And we have every reason to expect the process to accelerate. Twenty years from now you will be living in a different world.

Let us in conclusion, and by way of summary, set down some of the main points covered in this chapter:

1. The function of society is to serve all the reasonable needs of all the individuals who compose it. This, of course, is democracy.
2. The service of needs is carried out through various institutions. These institutions are departments of society, and each of them specializes in satisfying a certain group of needs.
3. Although institutions are rather permanent, they are nevertheless modified as needs and resources change. The supreme cause of their modification is scientific progress.
4. Major institutions serve enduring and universal needs.
5. Institutions are operated by people—they are established ways in which people behave in order to satisfy common needs. It follows, since human beings can act stupidly, that institutions are sometimes inefficiently operated.
6. Because of their comparative permanence, institutions have a stabilizing influence on our society, and tend to

protect us from sudden changes at the hands of ambitious leaders or inexperienced enthusiasts. In the words of a wise saying, "It is better to be governed by institutions than to be governed by men".

7. Totalitarianism was marked by the almost total collapse of institutions—not a modification, but a destruction. As a result, the normal service of needs broke down, the individual lost his rights and his significance, and the totalitarian state was forced to depend on foreign conquest for the means of its existence.

CHAPTER 26

WORK

ACCORDING to a well-known definition, play is an end in itself, but work is a means to an end. To put the point another way, interest is intrinsic in the first case and extrinsic in the second: we play because we want to, and work because we have to.

For what reasons then, do people work? Chiefly they do so in order to live. But mere living is clearly not a sufficient motive. Men work in order to live pleasantly and happily. By means of work they are enabled to marry, to establish a gracious home, to obtain an adequate social standing, to keep healthy, to enjoy the arts, to refresh themselves with recreation and travel. These and a thousand things more. The fundamental motive, as you see, is economic.

For what reasons do students work? Here the economic motive is more hidden and remote. They work because their future success and earning power depend on their present effort, because they desire the approval of their family, their friends and their teachers; because they take proper pride in their own character and achievements; and quite often because they have developed a strong interest in the work itself.

Perhaps it is true to say that work is rarely an unalloyed pleasure. For most people it is something to be tackled with as good a grace as possible—for some it is plain drudgery. Only for a few is it completely agreeable, and these few are either occupied with the arts or with some form of work for which they are peculiarly fitted. We shall



see later on that the choice of an occupation is supremely important to our happiness. The people who find work a drudgery are those who have been unfortunate or stupid in making this choice.

From the beginning of human time, work has been the rule of life. In all but the most bountiful parts of the earth, the savage was sorely put to it to keep himself and his family supplied with the bare means of existence. Even in what might be called his leisure moments, he was constantly on the alert to protect himself against predatory animals and predatory men. He lived from hand to mouth, and a surplus of almost any sort was beyond his power to acquire. For him, work was dangerous, exhausting and without end.

It was only as man learned, very slowly and painfully, to turn the forces of nature to his advantage that he won a little respite from toil. Each of his scientific discoveries—

how to kindle a fire, how to make pottery, the principle of the wheel, smelting of metals, invention of the bow—ameliorated his life and extended his leisure. He was enabled to reduce the number of his fears, to increase his comforts, and to express himself in poetry and the arts.

In our own day, scientific progress has placed the resources of the whole earth at our disposal. Power has been developed in many fields, machines have been invented to perform almost every kind of operation, and our control of nature has reached an amazing level of advancement. Yet despite all these things, we must still devote a considerable portion of our time to work. Scientific research must be carried on, machines must be manufactured, tended and repaired, tools of various sorts must be produced and used, organizations must be directed and operated. Even though hours of labour have been cut down, working conditions have been immensely improved, and life itself has been made better for thousands of people, mankind has not escaped from work. And there is no shadow of reason to believe that mankind ever will.

Indeed, it would be a sad day for the human race if work were to become unnecessary. "A curious statement to make!" perhaps you are saying—but it is a true one for all that, as the briefest examination will convince you.

Work gives structure to our lives. It is something definite and permanent around which the rest of life can be built. Whether we like it or not, we require to have a routine—a steady pattern of behaviour into which we can weave such variations as occur from day to day. Without a routine we feel lost and useless.

Consider a few illustrations. Here is a man who, due to some unfortunate circumstance, is out of work. He gets up late in the morning and moons about the house. He has nowhere to go, nothing to do, no purpose to serve. He is in

his wife's way, and has the sense of being a fifth wheel on the coach. After a while he becomes morose and embittered, and perhaps takes up with companions who lead him into evil ways. Only work can save him.

Here is another man—a musician—who is old and indigent. He falls out of all employment and is reduced to living on a pittance in a shabby room. So in desperation he makes a routine of his own. Every day at a certain hour he visits the kitchen doors of several restaurants to get scraps of waste bread. These he takes home in a satchel and cuts up into convenient sizes. Then—and again at a certain hour—he goes down to the park to feed the ducks. A poor enough routine to be sure, but it gives him a reason for being alive. At least the ducks look for him with eagerness and reward him with their confidence.

One more case. A family goes for a long vacation to a small summer hotel on the edge of the sea. For a day or two they are rather at a loss, but very soon each one of them has invented a routine. The parents read for a while in the morning, play a few rounds of clock-golf before lunch, row and fish in the afternoon, and spend the evening in bridge and conversation. The young folks play tennis in the morning, meet the boat in the early afternoon, swim and play games on the beach until dinner-time, and dance together in the evening. No one is at a loss any more; and when the family returns home, the members vie with each other in telling their friends about the marvellous holiday they have had.

These illustrations show what your study of habit has already shown, namely that we are creatures of routine. During most of life, work supplies the core of that routine; and when we have no work, we are forced to find another core to take its place.

FATIGUE AND BOREDOM

It has been said earlier in the chapter that work is rarely an unalloyed pleasure, and this is especially true of heavy or tedious work. The two great enemies of working efficiency, as you have no doubt discovered for yourself, are fatigue and boredom. When these can be reduced to a minimum, work ceases to be disagreeable and may even become a source of profound satisfaction. It is therefore desirable we should know exactly what fatigue and boredom are.

1. *Fatigue.* The main source of bodily energy is the glycogen stored in the liver. Muscular activity uses up the supply of glycogen and certain waste products are formed (phosphoric and lactic acids and carbon dioxide). Where muscular activity is light, glycogen is not exhausted, and the waste products are carried away as they are formed. But when muscular activity is heavy and sustained, glycogen is used up, and waste products accumulate.

You will have noticed that men in different manual occupations work at different rates. The rate at which a man works depends on two things: the amount of muscular effort he must make, and the length of his working day. Where muscular effort is moderate and the working day is short, the rate tends to be fast. The point is that a man must avoid exhaustion: if manual labour is his sole means of support, he must be careful not to work so hard one day as to be handicapped the next. He has all the ensuing years of his life to consider, and must conserve his physical powers. The farmer, for example, who sometimes works a twelve-hour day, commonly moves at a leisurely tempo.

The introduction of rest periods into industrial plants is a scientific attempt to control the problem of fatigue. By this means the waste products that reduce muscular energy

are not allowed to accumulate, and the body is kept at a good level of efficiency. The proper length and the proper distribution of rest periods for each type of work are determined by experiment.

There has been much argument about the question of mental fatigue, and the facts are by no means clear. Some authorities hold that the mind itself is unfatiguable. The argument, however, is largely academic, because everyone is aware that long stretches of concentrated mental effort are definitely fatiguing. A possible explanation may be this: concentrated mental effort is always accompanied by muscular tensions, and these muscular tensions cause fatigue. Next time you do a few hours of hard study, you can test this explanation for yourself by answering such questions as the following: Do your eyes and eyelids feel tired? Does your face feel stiff? Do your muscles ache a little? Is your energy low?

2. *Boredom.* There is no depletion of glycogen and no accumulation of waste products in this case. Boredom and fatigue are miles apart so far as physical effects are concerned. But mentally they are very much alike—so much alike that one is frequently mistaken for the other.

Boredom is caused by loss of incentive, and appears as a result of monotonous and uninteresting work, uncongenial company and tedious situations. With an increase of incentive it disappears.

Illustrations are all too easy to find! Take first the case of monotonous and uninteresting work. What comes to your mind? Such tasks as weeding the garden, washing a large stack of dishes, sandpapering off an old coat of paint, picking berries, and sewing an interminable seam. Modern industry is full of tasks similar to these. Owing to narrow specialization, many workers are condemned to perform the same little operation in the same way for months and even

years at a stretch. Do you wonder they become bored, careless, wasteful of materials and liable to accidents?

Uncongenial company is not so bad, because it can usually be escaped and afterwards avoided. Even the most wearisome person finally asks for his hat and goes home.

Last is the case of tedious situations. You have probably had some experience of these. Here are some examples. You go in high hope to hear a public address, and the speaker drones heavily on for an hour and a half. You are stranded on a wet day at a little railway junction waiting for a train that is three hours late. You have to take part in a game with three other people who hardly know how to play. But why go on? You can think of a dozen examples of your own.

Industry has tackled the question of boredom, and has found two main remedies: rest periods and music. Neither of these remedies goes to the root of the matter, which is narrow specialization, but they do alleviate boredom to a considerable extent.

The real cure for boredom is an increased incentive. Do you remember, for example, how you were sitting at home one evening with nothing to do and your eyes closing—when a cheery friend came in? In two minutes you were full of life and vigour! Even the old horse, when he comes within sight of home, arches his neck and increases his pace. Why the sudden change? Because the thought of oats and rest has entered his mind, and he has a new incentive.

To sum up, here is a way in which fatigue and boredom may be represented. First, the general equation at its highest level:

$$\text{Available Energy (10)} \times \text{Incentive (10)} = \text{Effort (100)}$$

Then Fatigue:

$$\text{Available Energy (1)} \times \text{Incentive (10)} = \text{Effort (10)}$$

And Boredom:

$$\text{Available Energy (10)} \times \text{Incentive (1)} = \text{Effort (10)}$$

Different degrees of Available Energy and Incentive could equally well have been shown, but the principle remains substantially the same at every level. The worst case of all, as you can imagine, is that in which fatigue and boredom occur together! The equation would then be:

$$\text{Available Energy (1)} \times \text{Incentive (1)} = \text{Effort (1)}$$

Theoretically, either Available Energy or Incentive might be zero, under which conditions Effort would not be forthcoming at all.

ABILITY TO WORK

We turn now to the ways in which the power to work is built up—a very practical and important matter. Two questions seem to arise: first, How is the ability to work developed? and second, How is willingness developed? Ability and willingness are two vastly different things, and either one of them can conceivably exist without the other. Both are necessary to any effective effort.

A couple of illustrations will make things clear. Jim Finney's mother is greatly in need of a small bookcase for the living-room, and he is tremendously keen to make her one. Jim, alas, is helpless with tools. He struggles with all his might, but only succeeds in spoiling a lot of material and finally producing a lop-sided article that would be an eyesore in the basement. He has plenty of willingness but no ability.

Bob Mitchell's mother is in the same situation, but Bob, though he is very handy with tools and could make a first-rate bookcase, is more interested in a dozen other things. He tells his mother in a vague sort of way that he has the bookcase in mind and will some time get round to its con-

struction. But he never even starts. He has plenty of ability but no willingness.

First, then, how is ability to work developed? By no other process than learning. In order to know how, you must learn how. You must familiarize yourself with the necessary techniques, and practise them to the point of efficiency.

There are certain principles on which expertness is based, and they apply in every line of endeavour, whether it be football, Latin or accountancy. They may be stated in four words: aptitude, interest, study and practice.

Aptitude depends on structure—on physical make-up, intelligence and temperament. Note how these three factors operate. A boy is eager to be a football player. He has the intelligence and temperament, but his physique is small and puny. Physical make-up ruins his aptitude and keeps him out of football.

Another boy is ambitious to be a lawyer. He has a fine-looking body and a suitable temperament, but his I.Q. is only 98. Lack of necessary intelligence reduces his aptitude to a low level and his ambition can never be realized.

A girl decides to become a nurse. She is strong and healthy, and has excellent intelligence, but her temperament is such that she is agonized by human suffering. Temperamental unsuitability destroys her aptitude for nursing, and she is forced to take up another line of work.

It would be hard to exaggerate the importance of all this. You will remember it was discussed earlier in the book under the heading of Physiological Limits. All degrees of aptitude occur. Your problem in choosing a vocation is to find one for which *your* physique, intelligence and temperament unquestionably fit you. There will be many vocations you can enter and in which you can be reasonably successful. There will be many others for which you are quite unsuited.

If you find yourself in one of the latter sort, you will look forward to a life of miserable failure.

The thing you must do is explore the whole vocational field before making a firm choice. You will find that vocations fall into groups and that these groups are subdivided into many branches and departments. First, select with the utmost care the group for which *your* aptitude is high, and then after still more careful study select the best branch or department *for you*. The right choice is the one in which your physique, your intelligence and your temperament combine to guarantee your success.

The idea can be shown in the form of an equation, and may be represented as follows:

The highest degree

$$\text{Physique (10)} \times \text{Intelligence (10)} \times \text{Temperament (10)} \\ = \text{Success (1000)}$$

Some other degrees

$$\text{Physique (1)} \times \text{Intelligence (10)} \times \text{Temperament (10)} \\ = \text{Success (100)}$$

$$\text{Physique (10)} \times \text{Intelligence (1)} \times \text{Temperament (10)} \\ = \text{Success (100)}$$

$$\text{Physique (10)} \times \text{Intelligence (10)} \times \text{Temperament (1)} \\ = \text{Success (100)}$$

The square peg in the round hole

$$\text{Physique (4)} \times \text{Intelligence (4)} \times \text{Temperament (4)} \\ = \text{Success (64)}$$

You will note that when one of the three aptitude factors is zero, success is zero too.

It is worth saying again, and with a good deal of emphasis, that though lack of aptitude in one line implies lack of aptitude in any closely related line, it nevertheless does not imply this in other and unrelated lines. The fact that a man would make a poor dentist must not be taken to mean he

would make a poor plumber or tennis player or comedian. Often the very qualities that produce low aptitude for one vocation produce high aptitude for another. The qualities, for example, that make for success in an accountant are very different from those that make for success in a salesman.

All of which is to say you must cut your coat according to your cloth. In order to select a vocation wisely, you must find out just what qualities—physical, intellectual and temperamental—you yourself possess, and then explore the vocational field to discover exactly where *your* qualities can be used to best advantage. And remember this: an expert machinist is a happier and more useful man than a third-rate physician.

We come now to the second of the four words that are the key to expertness, namely, *interest*.

It is obvious, of course, that interest is greatly affected by aptitude. We are chiefly interested in the things we are now able, or hope to be able, to do well. Interests blossom in the sunny air of success and wither in the icy winds of failure.

We have already discussed the fact that interests arise out of needs, and there is no point in going back over the discussion here. The question now is this: if human needs are fundamentally much the same, and interests arise out of needs, why is it that people's interests are so different? Why does Bill Baxter spend all his spare time at the work-bench in his basement and Dick Harper devote every leisure moment to playing the saxophone?

A very great deal—though not, of course, everything—depends on the interests with which a boy or girl is surrounded during the first fifteen years or so of life. Bill Baxter's father is a cabinet-maker, keen and expert in his work, who is for ever making something at home. From the time he could toddle, Bill has watched his father with admiration,



and has thought it a wonderful treat to be allowed to handle his tools. Furthermore, Bill has an aptitude for wood-working. So between one thing and another his happiest moments are spent at the bench.

Dick's family are bound up in music. They are never done playing various instruments, listening to records and the radio, and attending concerts. Their main talk centres about music and musicians. So Dick, who has an excellent ear, good intelligence and sensitive emotions, takes to the saxophone with enthusiasm and success.

That is how interests chiefly develop: they must exist somewhere in the social atmosphere of the person concerned, and they must be suited to his particular aptitudes. They need not originate in the family circle, though they frequently do. They may originate anywhere in the circle of

acquaintance, or even as the result of reading or of some vivid experience. Note for illustration the following cases:

Mary Thomson goes to a new school—a large high school in the city. The main sport of the girls is grass hockey, which is a game Mary has never seen before. She is a strong, speedy girl with excellent muscular co-ordination and she takes to grass hockey like a duck to water. The interest becomes strongly established and she continues to play the game for years after leaving school.

Agnes Mitchell reads a book on home nursing and her imagination is caught by it. She studies it from cover to cover. Then she takes a course in First Aid, and cultivates the acquaintance of a young nurse who lives on the same street. When she is old enough, she enrolls for training in the local hospital.

Ben Murray is sent out to the airport to deliver a message. A friendly pilot, who likes his sturdy appearance, takes him up for a short ride in a plane. Ben is absolutely thrilled. From that day his mind is filled with the idea of flying. He gets his school courses changed, he reads every book he can find on aeronautics, and he visits the airport at every opportunity. Eventually he becomes a pilot himself.

To sum up: our interests depend on our experience and our aptitudes. They can readily be cultivated. They are expanded by success and diminished by failure. There are probably a thousand things in which you could be interested if they were to come your way.

The third key to expertness is *study*. The point here is just this: expertness depends on a pattern of action, either mental or physical, and that pattern cannot be discovered without analysis. Study is the process by which the mind appraises various possible action patterns and selects the one that seems best for the purpose. It is really adjustment very carefully and thoughtfully done.

On the side of mental expertness, we have to acquire sound patterns of thought. In order to do so in any particular field—mathematics, literature, business or politics—we must gather all the information we can, and gain clear insight into underlying principles. Only then have we any right to form opinions. This process of gathering information and discovering principles is study. Through study our attitudes are established. When we establish them on the basis of sketchy information and shallow insight, so much the worse for us.

On the side of physical expertness the process is much more obvious. You will remember we begin with too many muscular responses, not too few. Out of the original overplus of reaction, we have to select a few efficient movements, and only by careful analysis and study can we do this. Once it has been thoughtfully done, we can proceed to the next stage.

At the risk of tiresome repetition let us consider a case. Annabelle Saunders has her heart set on becoming a fine pianist. What study must she do? On the mental side she must familiarize herself completely with the facts and principles of musical theory, she must steep herself in the many forms and styles of music, and she must learn to read musical scores as easily as she might read a book. This and much more.

On the physical side, she must eliminate every unnecessary muscular movement, and discover the best action-patterns for producing all the effects of which her instrument is capable. She must study to perfect her technique at every point in her progress.

Lastly, there is *practice*. Without practice no achievement is possible. After study has found out the right pattern of thought or action, that pattern must be established by continual and assiduous practice.

You will recall that practice (or drill) is based on three simple principles: attention, repetition and correctness. That is to say, you must give your whole mind to the task, you must repeat it over and over again at stated intervals, and you must not vary from the pattern you are seeking to establish.

Strange to say, there is only a small margin of difference between expertness and what may be called respectable performance. The expert has a slight but vitally important edge. The top-notch golfer, for instance, goes round in an average of seventy strokes; the good golfer, who does not win open tournaments, goes round in about seventy-four. The first-class shot gets ninety-nine or a hundred out of a possible hundred; the respectable shot gets ninety-seven or ninety-eight. The chess player of world-championship calibre can look forward about nine moves with accuracy; the fine player—professional but not in the world-championship class—can look forward about eight.

The same is true in the arts or in science. The real expert is just a shade better than his topmost competitors—but that shade makes all the difference in the world. He must practise unweariedly to achieve expertness, and then he must practise unweariedly to retain it. The very moment he relaxes his effort, the fine edge of his expertness is blunted and he sinks back to the rather common level of respectable performance. Witness the case of Mr. Robert Jones, an amateur who in one year won the four greatest golf tournaments in the world. At that time he was probably the finest and most consistent golfer who ever lived. His expertness was based upon a marvellous aptitude, an unflagging interest, keen study, and most assiduous practice. After his fourfold victory he gave up competitive golf, stopped his never-ending practice, and played merely for recreation. In one short

year he had dropped so far back that a score of men could beat him. Today, hundreds could do so.

WILLINGNESS TO WORK

We now come to the second question, namely: How is willingness to work developed? It is one thing to be able, and another thing to be willing.

The question is not so easy to answer as the first, but the acquirement of willingness can be based rather broadly on these four factors: Aptitude, Interest, Training and Self-respect.

Regarding *aptitude* and *interest* nothing more need be said. That they are factors in willingness as well as in ability is obvious enough. No one will deny we are commonly more willing to do things that are easy and interesting than to do things that are difficult and boring. If all the tasks to which we have to address ourselves were of the former variety and none were of the latter, then these two factors alone would probably suffice. But such is not the way the world wags. Over and over again in life we have to perform tasks for which our aptitude is low or in which our interest is lacking. These tasks, unpleasant though they are, must not only be done, they must be done well. Willingness, therefore, has to be developed through other factors as well as through aptitude and interest.

Training. This simply means the deliberate measures taken by society to instil sound habits of work and sound attitudes toward work in the individual. Among these measures are assistance in finding efficient patterns of mental and physical action, application of pressure on the individual to practise these patterns, and insistence that he shall carry them through to a complete and successful outcome.

First then, there is assistance in finding efficient patterns. In the course of its experience the human race has dis-

covered a vast number of reliable facts and principles, and has found out the most effective ways in which a great many things can be done. All this experience is placed at the disposal of the young. The process is not necessarily one of spoon-feeding, as you are well aware. It is an opening up of the great treasury of human knowledge and skill, and a powerful invitation to the young to enter and enrich themselves.

Second, there is application of strong social pressure to the young, so that they will be compelled to appropriate and practise the best patterns of thought and action. In other words, there is a steady emphasis on work.

This is a matter of the most profound importance. Work is a habit, and like every other habit it has to become ingrained by unremitting practice—*we learn to work only by working*. Woe betide the poor creature who never learns this fundamental lesson: he will be thrown off at the first wavering of his interest, lose heart at the first difficulty and be halted altogether at the first serious set-back. Perseverance with unattractive and arduous tasks is the result of long and dogged experience with work itself. Nothing can take the place of this experience.

Now it is the plain duty of society—through parents, teachers and early employers—to make doubly sure the work habit is established. The future happiness and usefulness of youth depends in a great degree on the thoroughness with which this is done. The man who cannot settle determinedly down to deal with every reasonable task that comes his way is not only an unfortunate and ineffective man, he is also the victim of neglected training.

One personal word. If you have reason to suspect you are in this class, there is still time for improvement. Work is a habit, and all habits can be modified. Set your teeth and struggle against the restless and rebellious feeling that comes

over you when you are faced with a disagreeable task. Think the matter through, and powerful motives will spring to your assistance. Above all, do not wait much longer—by the time you are thirty, you may be beyond saving.

Self-respect. Self-respect, strange though the statement may seem, is chiefly the outcome of training. Indeed, it is the finest outcome of all. A man's opinion of himself—the opinion he holds deep down in his own heart and does not necessarily reveal to anyone else—is the result of his experience with himself in ten thousand situations. Many people, as you know, are afflicted with a sense of inferiority. They believe themselves to be cowards or cheats or weaklings. On the other hand, there are many who regard themselves as highly talented, upright and able. Most of us rate ourselves somewhere between these extremes, and are probably nearer to the truth.

Your self-respect, therefore—your rating of yourself on the scale of human values—results from your comparing your own with the achievements and virtues of other people. It is not obtained, of course, from conscious comparison. You do not, that is to say, measure yourself deliberately against everyone you meet. The rating you give yourself is simply borne in upon you by the ordinary associations and undertakings of life.

Now there is no surer way of building self-respect than by honest achievement—and the amount of your achievement depends largely on the training that has established your power to work. Once the work-habit is firmly fixed, you can command success by doing every reasonable task with vigorous determination and carrying it through to the very end.

Out of this arises a powerful self-respect that supports you in everything you have to do. You come to regard yourself as the kind of person who cannot be turned aside by

difficulty or tedium, but who can always be depended on to tackle and complete a task.

You will see that the ultimate development of self-respect is the very essence of the willingness to work. Without it, a man is content with third-rate standards and feeble achievement; with it, he is satisfied with nothing but his best.

To summarize: ability to work is determined by aptitude, interest, study and practice; willingness to work is determined by aptitude, interest, training and the development of self-respect. If you would be a success in the world, you must not only know about these factors, but also apply them actively to your own life. The culmination of the whole process is the coming of an honest self-respect—when you have developed that, you have solved the problem of work and laid a solid foundation for happiness.

CHAPTER 27

MANNERS, MORALS AND LAWS

THERE are at least fifteen ways in which this chapter can be begun, and it is hard to know which of them to choose. Perhaps the best way out of the difficulty is to write no opening paragraph at all, but to begin with an illustration.

Imagine a group of English people, strangers to one another and from widely different classes, cast by shipwreck on an uninhabited though fairly fertile island. They are half-clothed and possess nothing but a few knives and such-like things they have carried in their pockets. If they



remain a year on the island before they are rescued, how will they live?

One thing is certain: their former class distinctions will quickly disappear. They will stand as equals together, both men and women; and leadership will depend on force of character, physical strength and resourcefulness.

We will suppose the group is reasonably co-operative—as indeed it must be in order to survive. The members will have to be courteous to one another or they will swiftly come to blows, and the group will break up into rival fragments.

They will also have to respect each other's persons and keep their hands off each other's property—otherwise there will be deadly discord and homicide among them. Even though the property consists of a rude shelter, a few rough implements, and a share of food, it will be defended with fierce determination. The treatment of women, unless it is fair and honourable, will call forth deep jealousy and anger.

There will be some important matters in which the individual must consider the welfare of the group, such as protection of water supply, procuring and distributing food, and keeping a sharp look-out for passing ships. So they will have to take counsel together to make a few laws. If they have no means of writing, then the laws will have to be stated in brief and simple terms and memorized by all.

You can see from this illustration that manners, morals and laws are just rather fixed ways in which people must behave in order to live harmoniously together. Manners are necessary to regulate ordinary social intercourse; morals are necessary to protect life, property, honour and self-respect; laws are necessary to assure the survival and general welfare of the group. Obviously the three overlap in many places: manners and morals merge into one another, and laws are concerned with the curbing of boorishness and the protec-

tion of life and property. But they are sufficiently different to be considered apart.

Any one of several forms of government might have arisen on the island. One strong and ruthless man might have seized control, several men might have leagued themselves together to dominate the rest, or the little society might have conducted itself in democratic fashion. Whichever form actually arose, manners, morals and laws would still be essential. They would, of course, differ widely in each case, but a society without them simply could not continue to exist.

MANNERS

Much has already been said about manners in this book. They can be defined as the customary ways in which members of a society show consideration for others in the lesser affairs of life. They have been called the oil of society; and when we use them we put restraint upon our own egoistic tendencies in the interest of someone else.

Social development in every individual is a slow progress from selfishness to altruism. As infants we are wholly concerned with our own comfort and amusement. Only by painful degrees, and after a great deal of training, do we learn to consider others. The courteous man is one in whom that training has taken good effect. Experience has shown him that discourtesy is like a boomerang—it brings forth discourtesy in return. Being a sensible person, he has profited by his experience, and has thoroughly learned Social Lesson Number One, which is: *My consideration for others is the source of their consideration for me.* And this, you will observe, is just another wording of the Golden Rule: Do to others as you would that they should do to you.

Manners differ in different societies. Indeed, the manners of one society often seem fantastic and ridiculous in

another. You would be taken aback if your friend greeted you with an Oriental salaam, or clicked his heels and bowed stiffly from the waist, or showed his appreciation of your hospitality by overwhelming you with flowery expressions of gratitude. Yet these manners are correct in certain parts of the world. If you were invited by a group of natives in Borneo to take part in a head-hunting expedition, they would be paying you a genuine—though most embarrassing—compliment.

Manners change as society changes, and great differences are to be seen even from one generation to the next. As life speeds up, people have less time for elaborate manners. The flocking of women into business and industry has had no small effect on their treatment by men—as witness the following half-humorous toast offered at a recent banquet: "Here's to the Ladies; once our superiors, now our equals!"

What are the main forms of mannerly behaviour among ourselves at the present day? A whole book of etiquette would be needed to contain the answer, but a few points can be very briefly mentioned. Remember, the essence of courtesy is consideration for others and suppression of selfishness.

1. *Customary phrases used in meeting and parting.* These should be learned in some variety in order to avoid woodenness. The person with one standard greeting for everyone is not only tiresome, he seems lacking in sincerity, and also is frequently guilty of disrespect. The idea is to suit the greeting to the person addressed. Parting phrases are much harder to manage—especially for the young. Perhaps the schools should give a short course entitled: *Taking One's Leave!* The matter is worth a moment's consideration.

It is reasonably easy to take graceful leave of our family and our intimate friends. The difficulty arises in parting from a stranger or a superior. Have you ever been at a complete loss to close an interview with one of your teachers? If

so, do you remember the embarrassing silence that descended on you after the business of your visit had been settled? The teacher opened and shut a drawer, looked out of the window, swung round in his chair, and in sheer desperation tried to keep on talking. You would have given your right arm to be safely on the other side of the door—but you sat on in a sort of helpless despair. Yet all you needed was a courteous phrase in some such vein as: “Thank you so much for helping me,” or “I know you’re a very busy person,” or “It’s good of you to have given me so much of your time.” Such a phrase shows consideration, and makes departure easy. One thing more. If you can manage it, a politely humorous ending is best of all. Many a clever person covers his retreat with a small witticism.

2. *Polite inquiries.* There is a wide field here and great opportunity for the individual touch. Customary phrases are numerous. We inquire about a person’s health, about his family and about his interests. Many polite inquiries do not, of course, call for any very definite answer. When we say, “How do you do?” for example, we certainly do not expect to receive a medical report.

3. *Good manners in conversation.* This has been dealt with already. The main idea, you will recall, is to hold our own ego-enhancement in check, and to draw the other person out.

4. *Polite behaviour.* This includes almost everything we do while in the company of others. The essence of it is consideration. Perhaps its finest expression is in our treatment of the very young and the very old, but it should be applied to all. Opening a door, closing a window, offering a seat, fetching a book, passing the cake, writing a letter—these and a thousand things more may be evidences of polite behaviour.

The discussion of manners may be closed with this com-

ment. Manners are not nearly as important as morals, but they are in far more frequent use. Also, our morals are taken for granted while our manners never are. Any one small piece of courtesy is of no great moment in itself, but our manners as a whole are of the utmost consequence. They afford society the most convenient way of appraising us, and the esteem in which we are held is largely an outcome of whether they are good or bad.

MORALS

To begin with a definition again, morals can be defined as customary ways in which members of a society show consideration for others in the major affairs of life. They have to do with the fundamentals of social existence. For the sake of complete clearness here are some of the matters that lie within the field of morals: Honesty, Truthfulness, Chastity, Industry and Self-Control.

You can see at once that no society in which these morals ceased to operate could survive for a single month. In such a case the society would break down into a horde of predatory animals, each seeking his own selfish and savage ends. There could be no co-operation, no institutions, no protection and no leisure. Soon there would be no science and no art. In a word: without morality, even the most primitive civilization is impossible.

We noted that manners vary from country to country and from period to period. So also do morals, though more slowly and to a more limited extent. Since human nature has been substantially the same in all ages—driven by the same basic needs and actuated by the same basic motives—it follows that the fundamental principles of social living have never changed. Moral codes throughout historic time, and in all probability before historic time, have compelled men to subdue their passions and control their selfish im-

pulses in the interest of the group. The primary fact behind all moral codes is this: the individual cannot survive alone; the group cannot survive unless its members have consideration one for another.

Thus the variation of morals from country to country and from period to period is superficial rather than fundamental. Its explanation is easily found. Societies have lived under many different geographical and climatic conditions, and have possessed widely different resources. Not only this, they have been subject to many divergent forms of government. Needs, therefore, have had to be satisfied in a great variety of ways; and the consideration of one person for another has had to be shown by different practices in different situations.

For illustration, compare the conditions of life among the Eskimos with those among the Arabs. Look at the climatic factors and food resources that control existence in these two cases. In both there is need of honesty, truthfulness, chastity, industry and self-control, but you would scarcely expect the expression of these basic moral principles to be identically the same among the two peoples. Their food, clothing, shelter and occupations are completely dissimilar. The practices that lead to survival in one environment would lead to extinction in the other, and consideration must be shown in different ways.

The tendency today is for moral standards to become more uniform over the whole earth. Through scientific progress, the control of natural forces is daily becoming more widespread, and the resources of the world are being placed at the disposal of all its inhabitants. As a result, the conditions of life are everywhere becoming more and more similar. The more similar they become, the more alike will be the ways in which consideration can be shown. Thus we may look forward to a time—still far off, perhaps—when variations between moral codes will be reduced to a minimum.

Religion has been a powerful force not only for the support of morality but also for its standardization. Whenever a religion has been sincerely accepted by great numbers of people belonging to many social groups, it has had the effect of casting their moral conduct in much the same pattern. If Christianity were to become the universal religion of mankind, it would exercise an enormous influence toward the establishment of a universal moral code.

LAWS

Law is the device by which those forms of behaviour that are essential to group existence and satisfactory group life are classified, made known and enforced. Not only morality, but also all other matters that have to do with the general welfare of society are controlled by law.

A sound law has three characteristics, which may be set down as follows:

1. It refers to some form of behaviour that is vitally important to the survival or to the successful functioning of society.
2. It is worded in precise, entirely unambiguous language.
3. It is capable of enforcement.

Let us look at each of these characteristics in turn and discuss them rather fully. A clear understanding of law is especially necessary to the citizen of a democracy.

First, a law must refer to some vitally important form of behaviour. No laws, you will note, are made in regard to manners, because lapses from courtesy are comparatively insignificant from the point of view of society as a whole. Moral issues, however, are immensely important, as we have seen, and laws cover them in great detail. Much regulation of business is of the moral sort, having to do with contracts and agreements and rights to property. Laws also control many other matters—such as protection of the individual,

defence of the country, maintenance of health, transportation and communications, conservation of natural resources, and so on—that are vital to the well-being of the nation.

Second, a law must be precisely worded. If it is not perfectly definite and unambiguous it can give rise to nothing but endless argument. Precise wording is increasingly difficult in our highly complex civilization; but, however difficult, it must be achieved. One of the sharpest criticisms of our laws as worded today is they are so involved in grammatical construction and so wrapped up in old-fashioned forms of expression that the ordinary person cannot understand them. For the most part, however, the wording is precise. One of these days it may be made intelligible to the layman.

Third, a law must be capable of enforcement. In a democracy this means two things: it must be acceptable to the great majority of citizens, and it must have behind it the strong arm of the state. Lacking either of these it soon becomes a dead letter.

There are clearly defined limits to the scope of law. There is a field, that is to say, in which a man's behaviour is his own private business. A law that tells you what chair to sit on, what coat to wear, what movie to attend, or what friends to choose is an infringement of your personal liberty and cannot be tolerated. If such a law were passed, you and all other citizens would simply ignore it. If a serious attempt were made to enforce it, you would resist with all your might.

Again, a law is no law at all if the government does not, or cannot, insist on its being obeyed. Words written on the statute book mean little or nothing unless they are backed up by the whole power of the state. The violation of a law must be followed by swift, certain and sufficiently severe penalties. When such penalties are not enforced, the law

loses its validity and for all practical purposes has ceased to exist.

One point more. Law is not entirely made by parliament, though parliament is its main and original source. In the course of their work, magistrates and judges must interpret the law as it applies to particular cases, and these judgments of theirs are recorded for the future guidance of the courts. The decision of a judge, that is to say (unless it is reversed on appeal), is regarded as binding by another judge in a similar case. Thus, a second type of law arises, called case law. It is based on statute law, of course, but it is rather more concrete and specific.

RIGHTS

From the foregoing discussion, we come directly to the question of rights. Over and over again we hear people talking about 'the rights of the citizen', or 'the rights of man'. What exactly do such phrases mean?

In a modern state, all our important rights are derived from our laws. These rights are clearly set down in the statute book; our enjoyment of them is guaranteed by the state, and their violation by any person or groups of persons is punished by the courts. We have the legal right, for example, to go about without fear of bodily harm, to control our own property, to be imprisoned only after a fair trial, to worship according to our own beliefs, and to express our opinions.

We have more than legal rights, however. We have the right to behave in any way that does not conflict with the rights of others. That is to say, we can do anything that does not break the law. Within wide limits our lives are our own to live as we please—we can eat, dress, work, play and associate much as we like. So long as we do not act

against the reasonable interests of other people, there is no restriction placed upon our actions.

Now a moment's consideration will convince you that apart from society no rights are possible. Legal rights are obviously of social origin, since they rest on laws—and laws must be accepted and enforced by society. The other rights we spoke of—though too varied and harmless to be covered by law—depend also on society for their protection; they are derived from society to this extent at least: their infringement is punishable. Thus all our rights are the gift of society, and it is within the power of society to take them away.

For illustration, let us look at a statement in the American Constitution which says that man has certain 'inalienable rights', namely: 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness'. This is a noble statement, and in the main a true one, but it does not stand up to close analysis.

No rights are 'inalienable' to the extent that they cannot be alienated by society itself. An American commits a cold-blooded murder, and after a fair trial is sentenced to death. His liberty is lost at once, his pursuit of happiness is surely over, and after a short interval his life is forfeit. American society, for due and proper cause, has taken his so-called inalienable rights away. These rights are inalienable *just so long as the citizen obeys the laws of his country*.

For the sake of your clear understanding of rights, take the case of a man who leaves civilization altogether behind him and lives in the neighbourhood of savage tribes, who regard him with hostility. What rights has he? The savages allow him none, and the society he has left is powerless to protect him. He must trust solely to his intelligence, his strength and his fleetness. His life, his liberty and his goods must be defended by himself alone. His only right is what he can enforce with his own arm. If a wild beast springs



upon him or the savages take him captive, it will be of no use for him to protest against such violation of his 'rights'—inalienable or otherwise. In order to acquire rights again, he must either be accepted as member of a savage tribe or he must return to civilization.

FREEDOM

It is one of our proudest democratic boasts that we are free people. We have freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, freedom of worship. Mr. Roosevelt, speaking for the United States, promised in addition freedom from want and freedom from fear. If there is one word more than another that we cherish as the symbol of our citizenship, it is the word freedom. We would do well to understand it clearly.

Freedom may be defined as the uninterrupted enjoyment of rights; and from this definition you will see it is the gift

of society. Rights are derived from state authority; freedom to enjoy them depends on state protection. Apart from society neither rights nor freedom exist.

We come here to this curious fact: there is no freedom without restriction. Your uninterrupted enjoyment of rights is impossible without the restriction of other people's power to interfere with it; the freedom of other people is impossible unless you are prevented from limiting their behaviour. The universal enjoyment of rights, which we call democracy, is a clear outcome of the fact that individuals are compelled by law to curb their passions and their greed. The saying is old and true that without law there is not liberty but licence.

It is within the power of the state, however, to reduce freedom if such a step is generally acknowledged to be necessary in the common interest. Wartime regulation is a good example. Under the grim and exacting pressures of war, there is restriction of speech, restriction of purchase, and restriction of occupation. Thousands of men are drafted into the armed forces; thousands of others are assigned to war industry. Thus in an emergency—and in order that freedom itself shall endure—many rights of the citizen are temporarily taken from him. And this is proper. A man fighting for his life cares nothing for the fact that his shoelace is untied.

In peacetime, matters are very different. Our chief concern then is to retain our rights and if possible to extend them. We zealously preserve our freedom and resent any effort needlessly to limit it. Wartime restrictions—especially in what we regard as our private lives—are no longer acceptable. Even at the expense of some hardship, we prefer that state regulation of our affairs should be held down to the essential minimum.

One more point remains to be emphasized. Our freedom

can be interfered with only by *other people*—not by natural forces. A man imprisoned in jail has lost his freedom, but a man kept at home by a blizzard has not done so; a girl working in an office has given up some of her freedom for the sake of economic security; a girl waging war against caterpillars in her garden has no sense of being restricted. When we lose freedom it is always *at the hands of people* who are interfering with our rights, and who are pursuing their own selfish interests at our expense. We may complain bitterly about the way in which the forces of nature prevent us from doing as we please, but we do not think of their action as a limitation of our freedom.

JUSTICE

We come lastly to justice, which may be defined as the means by which we are protected in the enjoyment of our rights. Justice is administered and enforced by the courts, whose authority comes from the state and whose decisions are backed up by the police.

You will see that our rights and our freedom depend very greatly on the wisdom and impartiality of the courts. Where the courts become feeble or corrupt—as has many times happened in human history—the value of citizenship falls to a low ebb. There is no more effective way of robbing men of their freedom than by permitting such things as birth, wealth, creed and privilege to influence our magistrates and judges.

In the eyes of the law all men are equal. This is one of the foundation stones of democracy, and woe betide the nation that casts it aside. There are many respects in which men are far from equal—in strength, intelligence, industry and integrity—but they must have perfect equality before the law. Every man, irrespective of his position or ability, must be protected in the enjoyment of his rights; equally

with every other man he must be permitted freely to follow out the pattern of life guaranteed to all men by the state. For to take away this protection is to render his citizenship worthless.

Our whole democracy, therefore, rests on the authority and impartiality of the courts. It follows that magistrates and judges must be learned in the law, wise in their understanding of human nature, and absolutely just in their decisions. In order that they may fulfil these three basic requirements, they are chosen from the legal profession, they are mature both in age and experience, and no outside pressure (even on the part of the government) is allowed to bear upon them. They are well paid, and cannot be removed from office except on grounds of insanity or proven abuse of their position. In a word, everything is done to guarantee their wisdom and integrity.

A question has probably arisen in your mind concerning those cases—and they occur in spite of all efforts to the contrary—where the decision reached by a judge convicts an innocent man. Should this be set down as an injustice? A certain man, for example, convicted of robbing a bank, is duly sent to jail, and a year later his innocence is absolutely established. How is such a turn of events to be regarded? The question certainly calls for consideration.

Mark well the answer. The judge gave his decision on the basis of all the evidence that could be discovered and brought to his attention. He gave his decision after careful and unbiased thought. Therefore the defendant received justice. The fact that the man was afterwards proved to be innocent does not mean there was an absence of justice—it means there was a miscarriage of justice. Blame cannot be attached to the judge, since he did everything humanly possible to assure the defendant of a fair trial. At the time, and in the light of all information then available, justice was

done. Miscarriage of justice was due, not to failure of duty on the part of the judge, but to the unavailability at that time of certain evidence afterwards discovered.

You will have noticed that appeals are often allowed from the judgment of a lower court to that of a higher, and that decisions are sometimes reversed. This is one of the ways in which we are safeguarded against injury. The lower court gives judgment with impartiality and according to the evidence—justice is done. An appeal is taken from this judgment, and a court of appeal, consisting of several judges (always an odd number), reviews the whole case, re-examines the evidence, and with equal impartiality reverses the decision of the lower court—again justice is done. Judges may occasionally lapse from perfect understanding; evidence may be suppressed, distorted or even invented; but when the court acts after careful deliberation and in perfect good faith, there is no injustice.

* * * * *

Perhaps the chapter can be best summed up by setting down in compact form the six definitions we have discussed.

Manners are the customary ways in which members of a society show consideration for others in the lesser affairs of life.

Morals are the customary ways in which members of a society show consideration for others in the major affairs of life.

Laws are devices by which those forms of behaviour that are essential to group existence and satisfactory group life are classified, made known, and enforced.

Rights are either legal or customary. Legal rights are guaranteed us by the state (through the device of law), and their violation by any person or group of persons is punishable by the courts. Customary rights, though not written

down in the statute book, are also guaranteed by the state to the extent that they cannot be violated with impunity.

Freedom is the uninterrupted enjoyment of rights.

Justice is the means, through the agency of the courts, by which we are protected in the enjoyment of our rights. It is the guarantee of our freedom.

CHAPTER 28

SOCIAL CONDITIONING

THE question to be answered in this chapter is one we have touched on before, namely: By what process does an infant grow up to be a Canadian or an Englishman or a Greek? The general answer is that he does so by social conditioning; and our purpose now is to find out exactly what social condition is, and how it operates.

You are well aware that a new-born child has no culture, that he has no ideas, no skills, no social graces and no artistic tastes. All he has is a physical structure. He possesses a body on which are impressed the characteristics of his race, he is endowed with a certain degree of intelligence, and he is moved to action (due to his autonomic system and endocrine glands) by a certain quality of temperament. This is the sum-total of his inheritance. All else he will acquire through experience with his environment.

Infants of all races are much the same at birth. Apart from the physical characteristics of race—colour of skin, features, height and so on—they differ very little. All degrees of intelligence and all qualities of temperament occur among all races. There is no biological reason why an infant of any race cannot—if transferred at birth—develop into a thoroughly satisfactory member of another. There is, however, a social reason. His physical characteristics, when these are very different from those of the race to which he is transferred, act as a bar against his complete acceptance. As human society is constituted today, physical as well as mental and temperamental similarity is widely regarded as necessary to marriage and full citizenship.

The point we are emphasizing here is this. Aside from differences in physical characteristics—which after all are superficial—every new-born baby is potentially a member of any social group on earth. Place him among any people you will, and he will acquire the language, customs, traditions and outlook of that people.

The reason for this fact, as of course you know already, is the amazing adjustability of the human being. The human nervous structure is relatively unorganized at birth; connections can be set up in accordance with conditions met in the environment. Thus, every baby is highly educable, and can be developed almost as his society pleases. Brought up by Zulus in the Zulu country, his mind will be filled with Zulu ideas, his muscles will be trained to Zulu skills, his manners and morals will be in terms of Zulu custom, and his taste will be for Zulu music and dancing—in a word, he will be a Zulu.



So much is fundamental. We now come to an inquiry into the way in which social conditioning occurs. By what means does a society form the young in its own pattern? How are Canadians or Englishmen or Greeks produced?

In order to stand on firm ground in this discussion, we must go back for a moment to human needs and their resulting motives. The needs of a baby are for food, clothing and shelter—for comfortable bodily conditions. At the earliest stage his motives are like those of a little animal. But soon he becomes aware of the people around him, and of the effect these people have on his well-being. He begins to need companionship and approval, and his motives accordingly expand. It becomes necessary that he should make efforts to gain love, affection and good will. He gradually realizes that both his physical comfort and his happiness depend on the way in which other people regard him. As a result he is eager to please, anxious to be praised, and immediately depressed by coldness or displeasure.

Now, since his enjoyment and his unhappiness come so largely from the approval and the disapproval of those around him, it follows that he is extremely suggestible. He is so keenly alive to the wishes and opinions and behaviour of others, he learns almost as he breathes.

It would be a mistake, however, to think of him as nothing but a sponge. His own nature must be taken into consideration too. He has his own ego to enhance, his own selfish desires to serve. The progress from crude egoism and selfish greed to courteous, considerate behaviour is often slow and difficult. Much depends on the temperament of the child: some children yield easily to social pressure; others fight every inch of the way. But when this has been said, it is still obvious that the child's dependence on society is so great and he himself is so weak, he cannot but conform to the social scheme of things.

Consider the case of a small child in his family circle. Above all things he requires to be a beloved and fully accepted member of the group. To be coldly treated or ignored or frowned upon is beyond his power to bear. Whatever is expected of him he tries to do. He learns the language of his family down to the last detail of accent and pronunciation, he imitates family behaviour to the utmost of his ability, he quickly adopts family attitudes—in short, he adjusts himself wholeheartedly to the family way of life.

Let us suppose the family to be Canadian. What then? By the time he has reached his sixth year, the child is already set in the fundamentally Canadian pattern. His speech, his manners, his morals, his tastes in food and clothing, his games and his pleasures, even his points of view—all these are of the typically Canadian sort.

He goes to school, and the process is not only continued but focalized and accelerated. The Canadian school is a mirror of all that is best in Canadian life. Its one aim is to develop the finest possible Canadian citizens. It imparts the knowledge, establishes the skills, perfects the social behaviour, and builds up the artistic tastes necessary to useful and happy life in Canada. The child from a Canadian home, who is educated in a Canadian school, cannot but become a typical Canadian.

Add to all this the steady pressures exerted by the community in which the child lives. His friends and acquaintances exemplify the Canadian way of life and cherish the Canadian point of view. The institutions that surround him are thoroughly Canadian in spirit. Everywhere he turns, he sees Canadian scenes and hears Canadian voices. *He is exposed to nothing else.* The sum-total of his experience, the whole content of his mind, the entire fabric of his behaviour—all these are Canadian from first to last.

INCIDENTAL AND INTENTIONAL CONDITIONING

Social conditioning is of two main kinds: incidental and intentional. Let us look at each of these in turn, and consider its effect on the developing citizen. You will find that the two kinds overlap in a thousand places, and cannot be separated except for purposes of analysis.

Incidental social conditioning goes on without conscious effort on the part of society. It could be described as due to social atmosphere. All the surroundings of the Canadian child are Canadian in character—the landscape, the climate, the furnishings of his home, the clothing he wears, the food he eats, the amusements he enjoys, the occupations of his elders, the talk he hears, and many things more. Day in and day out this environment shapes his thoughts and actions. Without a vestige of planning on anyone's part, it continually Canadianizes him. Everything in it he comes to regard as *fitting and right*. So much so that if some day he visits a different country, he refers to the characteristics of that country (its buildings, furniture, dress, food, music, and so on) as odd, quaint, or outlandish. It does not immediately occur to him that things fitting and right in Canada may be wholly unfitting and wrong in Calcutta or Cairo.

The attitudes of his family and friends affect him in the same way. Without the slightest awareness of the manner in which his mind is being furnished, he picks up their likes and dislikes, their opinions and beliefs, and makes these his own. Being young, he is far from critical. He accepts as logical and right the ideas that are everywhere around him, and comes to have an outlook similar to that of Canadians in general.

Intentional social conditioning powerfully reinforces the incidental variety. Society is not content to trust only to the effect of a Canadian environment on the child, it undertakes

to Canadianize him by direct and carefully planned methods. Education in this sense of purposeful effort begins in the family group. The child is not permitted to learn by sheer imitation; he is definitely taught. He is persuaded and instructed; appeals are made to his reason; he is praised for his successes and punished for his failures. His speech is corrected, his manners are improved, his honesty and truthfulness are deliberately built up. It is the clearly understood intention of his family to bring him into line with the best Canadian standards they know.

At school the process is intensified. The whole system is saturated with the Canadian spirit. Not only is the child instructed in all matters useful to the Canadian citizen, his heart is kindled by Canadian tradition and his mind is attuned to Canadian democracy.

By these two kinds of social conditioning, the incidental and the intentional, the Canadianization of the child is inexorably brought about. He is formed in the Canadian pattern, and in due course becomes a typical citizen.

It takes no great insight to see that precisely the same process goes on in every country. All you have to do is exchange the word 'Canadian' for the word 'Eskimo' or 'Mexican' or 'English' in the foregoing paragraphs, and the matter is clear.

Let us consider one more example for the sake of completeness—a 'horrible example'. What happened to the youth of Germany? How is it that Nazi youth were made into such eager and even fanatical supporters of a system we regard as senseless and brutal to the point of insanity?

It was done by education, by continuous and unremitting pressure on the part of the ruling group. From infancy these young men and women were exposed to the pomp and pageantry of the Nazi military machine. The

ideal of an exalted and world-dominating Germany was held constantly before their eyes. Their passions were inflamed by boastful harangues: their minds were fed on distorted science and the myth of 'Aryan' superiority; their view of individual freedom was that of the Gestapo, to which many of them proudly belonged. They had to adjust themselves to a ruthless and irrational environment, and as a result they became willing slaves of past or future Nazi overlords. From the democratic point of view, they were all mad together.

The pity of it is that the conditioning is rather permanent. It has not been undone by defeat of the Nazi power and overthrow of the Nazi system. A whole generation will have to die out before the world is cleansed of the totalitarian disease.

CONDITIONING AND RACIAL GROUPS

On a smaller scale, the effect of social conditioning can be seen clearly in the case of two racial groups under one government, or in the case of a minority within the state. Excellent examples of the first case are England and Scotland, and the two racial stocks in Canada; an example of the second is the Doukhobor colony in British Columbia.

England and Scotland have been united under one monarchy since 1603. The peoples are very much the same in habit of life, general education and outlook. Yet an Englishman remains an Englishman and a Scotsman a Scotsman. How are the differences between them brought about? Simply by differences in their social conditioning. When, as often happens, an English child is raised in Scotland by Scottish people, that child cannot be distinguished from Scottish children. Exactly the same principle applies—in reverse, of course—when a Scottish child is raised in England by English people.

The differences between the two peoples are in speech, in tastes, and in loyalties. In all these fields social conditioning operates. The variation in speech needs no discussion. The variation in tastes is due to natural resources and traditions. England has always been a wealthier country than Scotland, and this fact is reflected in food, clothing, housing, and all-round comfort. Where the Scottish people were obliged for many generations to content themselves with the bare necessities of life, the English lived very well. Thus in Scotland the tradition of strenuous effort, endurance of hardship, and thrift has been handed down, while in England there is the tradition of greater security and a well-heaped table.

Again, historical traditions are different. Each people has its own heroes, its own tales of glorious achievement, and its own days of remembrance and festivity. Where the Scottish boy delights in the story of Bannockburn and sorrows over the tragedy of Flodden Field, the English boy looks proudly back to Agincourt and the defeat of the Great Armada.

So also the two peoples differ in their loyalties. Stand shoulder to shoulder as they may—and do—in defence of Britain and the British Commonwealth of Nations, yet each of them has loyalties unshared by the other. Thrill as they may—and do—to everything that speaks of British honour and British unity, yet each of them has sources of emotion that are wholly its own. Thus the love of Scotland and of all things Scottish is the abiding loyalty north of the Tweed; and south of that river, the abiding loyalty is to Merry England and to all things English.

Let us apply exactly the same methods of analysis to the two racial stocks in Canada. How does it come about that Pierre, raised on a Quebec farm, differs so much from the

Peter he would have been if he had been raised in a city in British Columbia?

Consider first the actual situation. Pierre is of French stock, speaks the French language, and embraces the Catholic faith. He is a member of a large family whose source of livelihood is the soil, and he has always enjoyed a rich and intimate family life. He has been steeped since childhood in the traditions of Quebec, and has been taught to think of her interests as a sacred trust. All the influences of his environment, his family and his community have worked together to make him what he is.

Now what would have happened if Pierre had become Peter—if he had been adopted at birth by an average family in Vancouver? His racial features and complexion would hardly have been noticed. So much for the matter of race! He would have spoken English and embraced the Protestant faith. He would have been a member of a small family—perhaps an only child—and a great many of his intimates would necessarily have been outside the family circle. He would have been steeped in the traditions of Canada as a whole, and would certainly not have regarded the interests of Quebec as a sacred trust. In a word, his social conditioning would have been different in a thousand particulars. There is no original difference between Pierre and Peter. Each of them is a product of the social pressures to which he has steadily been exposed.

It should, however, be added, and with all emphasis, that Pierre and Peter—despite obvious dissimilarities of development—are still sufficiently alike to be good Canadian citizens. A great many of the influences that have formed them are identically the same. Differ though they may in some important respects, they have enough in common to hold them together in bonds of brotherhood.

We have still to look at the case of a small minority

within the state, and the Doukhobor colony in British Columbia presents an excellent illustration. The fact that there are other Doukhobor colonies can be left out of account.

Here is a group of people of Russian stock, speaking the Russian tongue, and holding a religious belief that runs counter to the law of Canada in several quite important regards. How is such a minority perpetuated?

The Doukhobor child is born into a close community and is shut off as much as possible from the influences of ordinary Canadian life. He is taught a language in which he cannot communicate with other Canadians, and his mind is furnished with the ideas that permeate the life of his sect. As a result of his conditioning, when he is grown up he regards the flesh of animals with horror, he declines to register the births, deaths and marriages that occur in his family, he sets his face against Canadian schools, and refuses the call to military service. His moral views, his habits of life, and his general outlook are those of his own people. He has experienced nothing else. He is the product of the social influences to which he has been exposed.

In the light of all this, it is easy to see why Doukhobors resist the law that compels them to send their children to a Canadian school. They are afraid the school will condition their children away from the ideas they cherish, and in time break down the community itself. And in this they are perfectly right, for every generation sees a weakening of community ties. In the long run—though it may be a very long run—Canadian thought will penetrate the well-guarded stronghold, and Doukhobors will become ordinary Canadians.

Here is one more case, for good measure—that of a war-time evacuee from London, England, to Victoria, B.C. It happens to be a true story, and it is included because it

shows how a marked change in social conditioning can bring about marked changes in a previously conditioned personality.

Arthur Jackson was a boy of twelve, the son of a not very well-to-do English family. His speech was decidedly Cockney, his manners were crude, and he was very helpless in anything of a practical nature. He was, of course, a tremendous believer in all things English, and had all the habits and tastes of his class.

On being evacuated from England, he was taken wholeheartedly into a very fine Canadian family in Victoria. There were two other boys in the family, one twelve and the other fourteen, and they welcomed him as a brother. He was surrounded from the beginning with affection and kindness.

For some months, in spite of his good fortune, Arthur was a most unhappy boy. Canadian speech, Canadian ways, and especially Canadian deftness and ingenuity in dealing with practical problems, made him feel strange and helpless. He saw his foster-brothers handling tools, sporting equipment and fishing tackle; he watched them swimming like eels and sailing their boat like veterans; he observed the ease and success with which they got along in school—and his heart sank to his boots. No matter how kind everyone was and how much encouragement he got, he felt like an outsider.

This was a necessary stage. Before a new habit is formed, we must be discontented with the old one. Arthur was going through his period of discontent. He had to be made sharply aware that the English pattern of behaviour was not in line with the Canadian environment and the features of Canadian life.

But the yeast was working. By slow and painful degrees, Arthur began to change. Within a year his Cockney accent was hardly noticeable, and his manners were those of his

adopted country. Within two years he could use tools with some skill, play tennis rather well, and swim with confidence. His school work had become respectable, his social contacts had become normal, and his sense of belonging to his foster-family had become strong. At the end of four years he was an enthusiastic supporter of all things Canadian; and so far as the eye and ear could perceive, a Canadian himself.

There is, however, one thing more to say. The transformation of Arthur was not—and never could be—complete. In many deep respects he remained English. There were certain loyalties and certain ideas that were never shaken by his new experience—his love for his parents, his warm feeling for England, his personal attachment to a king whom he had often seen and admired. But to his old loyalties he had added others he would also never lose, for he had been inspired by Canadian traditions and adjusted to the Canadian way of life.

Let us now turn from particular cases to the making of a general summary. We have reached a point in our discussion where we can set down the main fields in which social conditioning operates, and for the sake of clear thinking we should have them concisely before us. Here then, is the list for your critical consideration:

1. Speech
2. Manners
3. Moral principles
4. Religious beliefs
5. Scientific ideas
6. General outlook, including the political
7. Skills and practices of all sorts
8. Tastes in food, clothing, housing, furniture, and so on
9. Tastes in literature, music and art.


Careful study of this list will show that very little indeed

lies beyond the range of social conditioning. About the only thing that does so is physical structure—and this is a fact worth noting. Facial features, skin colour, and to some extent hair, are beyond the power of society to change. This almost certainly is the fact that lies behind the reluctance of a society to open its borders and its heart to what it terms an 'unassimilable' racial group.


ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL CONDITIONING

It seems wise to conclude this chapter with some illustrations of social conditioning that lay bare the process itself. In order to understand these illustrations fully, you must recall to mind the discussion of conditioning earlier in the book. The key to the process, you will remember, is this: When two or more neural arcs are simultaneously active, there tends to be a connection set up between them. As a result, a stimulus comes to touch off a response other than the one it originally produced.

We shall take first a case of social conditioning of speech, and we can very well use the experience of Arthur Jackson for the purpose. Arthur's original accent was Cockney, and among other things he said 'lidy' (the 'i' pronounced as in 'tidy') instead of 'lady'. Whenever he said 'lidy' the approval of his foster-family was lacking, but whenever he said 'lady' he advanced in their regard. The diagram is as follows:



So far Arthur might have been discouraged altogether from attempting to convey the idea, but the process had another side.



Thus 'lidy' produced discomfort, and 'lady' produced satisfaction, and in due time the new bond was established.

As a second case, take that of a child whose family believes a vocal solo should be listened to in courteous silence. The child is as chatty and restless as most children are, and is quite unaware that any such rule of good breeding applies.

This is how he is socially conditioned:

S_1 (Talk and noisy movement) \longrightarrow R_1 (Frowns of annoyance)
 S_2 (Frowns of annoyance) \longrightarrow R_2 (Sense of shame)

Also:

S_1 (Quiet self-control) \longrightarrow R_1 (Social approval)
 S_2 (Social approval) \longrightarrow R_2 (Satisfaction)

In this way talk and noisy movement are gradually eliminated and quiet self-control comes to be preferred.

The third and last case is one of social conditioning in literary taste. A certain boy—whom perhaps you know!—has developed an appetite for underworld stories of the crude type, stories written in poverty-stricken English and dealing with raw emotion. The members of his family are people of literary refinement, who place great value on style, diction and ideas. There is nothing narrow about their taste, but they have a contempt for poor craftsmanship in the art of writing.

If he is lucky, this is what happens to the boy:

S_1 (He reads trash) \longrightarrow R_1 (Family disgust)
 S_2 (Family disgust) \longrightarrow R_2 (Embarrassment)

And:

S_1 (He reads something
worth while) \longrightarrow R_1 (Family approval)
 S_2 (Family approval) \longrightarrow R_2 (Satisfaction)

In the end, if the social pressure is applied continuously enough and long enough, the boy will acquire a sound literary taste and will have as much contempt for trash as his family has.

Sufficient has now been said to explain the nature of social conditioning, and to show its enormous importance in every society. In this chapter we have discussed it in relation to the individual, and particularly to the child; in the next we shall discuss it in relation to the public in general.

CHAPTER 29

INFLUENCING PUBLIC OPINION

PRESSURE is forever exerted—by individuals, by groups, and by the state itself—to change the patterns in which people think and act. This pressure takes many forms, of which advertising, propaganda and education are the chief. It is exerted in many ways and through many channels. The purpose of this chapter is to make you sharply aware of the methods used to influence your behaviour: it has been written partly for your enlightenment and partly for your protection.

Let us first recall one of our earlier discussions ("Development of the Mind"), in which we examined the ways in which our opinions are built up and our judgments directed. The content of the mind, you will remember, is composed of ideas we acquire through experience; and our rationality or otherwise depends on the correctness of these ideas. We observe the sequences of events presented to us, and when certain sequences occur frequently and without variation, *we expect them to recur in precisely the same order*. If the sequence A B C has become established in our mind, we expect A always to be followed by B, and B by C. To be more specific, if A (forgetting to turn off the headlights of the car) has invariably been followed by B (a run-down battery), and this has invariably been followed by C (trouble with father), then forgetting to turn off the headlights of the car is *expected* to cause trouble with father.

You will remember too that false sequences can be acquired as well as true ones. Inaccurate observation fre-

quently brings this about, as also does jumping to a conclusion after observing only one or two cases. Let us take a moment to look at these two sources of false sequences again. The third—and perhaps worst—source, we shall examine more fully when this has been done.

1. *False Sequences Acquired Through Faulty Observation.* A single illustration will be sufficient to refresh your memory. A certain man believes that by adopting a bullying tone he can bend other people to his will. All his life he has been in a position of some authority and has established the sequence A (browbeating) — B (submission). He has completely failed to observe the resentment he has aroused, and has not realized that the success of his technique has been due to his position of authority. He is therefore completely taken aback and bewildered when he finds later on, and in dealing with people independent of his control, that A (browbeating) can lead to B₁ (angry resistance).

2. *False Sequences Acquired Through an Unsound Generalization.* Again a single illustration will suffice. A girl has a dream about her brother who is living in a distant city, and next day she receives a letter from him. On another occasion, she dreams she is invited to a wedding, and a day later such an invitation duly comes along. From these two cases she establishes the belief that dreams are sure indications of future events. She proceeds to put her trust in them—with results you can readily imagine!

3. The third source of false sequences cannot be dealt with so briefly, and you will be well advised to note it with the utmost care. It provides the most common way in which public opinion is influenced, and can be described as the *transmission of false sequences from one person or group to another.*

Many idiotic, useless, and even harmful sequences are so

transmitted, as you know. Prejudices, superstitions, and many other erroneous ideas are implanted in people's minds, with disastrous results to their thinking and judgment. Thus, people come to be stupidly afraid of ghosts, or to look down on everyone with a different colour of skin, or to cherish a hatred of some particular class, or to believe that banknotes grow on mulberry bushes. We shall shortly see how the transmission of sequences can be done, but focus your mind for a moment on the fact that it *is* done. You might very profitably inquire into how much it has been done to you.

TECHNIQUE OF TRANSMISSION

What, then, is the general technique of transmission? Before answering the question there is one vital point to make, namely this: The technique is the same whether true or false ideas are transmitted. No fault can be found with the technique itself, but only with its abuse. In this it is similar to all the other procedures we derive from science—a gun may be used by a robber to relieve you of your money, but it may also be used by a soldier to defend your liberty. The technique of transmission is neither good nor bad; it can be used to build up a rational mental content or to warp the mind of the receiver.

There are three ways in which the technique can be operated: either by suggestion, by persuasion, or by coercion. Any combination of these is of course possible in any particular case, and it is not often that one of them is used alone. For the sake of simplicity, however, we will consider them in turn.

1. *Suggestion.* This depends on two main factors: the prestige of the person making the suggestion, and the ignorance of the person receiving it. Regarding the first, you will readily agree that you are greatly influenced by the esteem in which you hold the individual who offers you a

new idea. If he rates low in your esteem you give his idea scant consideration; if he rates high, you are very apt to accept it. In the case of a child, parents and teachers have enormous prestige—indeed most grown-up people are regarded as fountains of wisdom. When we get older, prestige tends to pass to those who occupy important positions and to those who are regarded as ‘authorities’. These people, who are found in all walks of life, are listened to with respect and their ideas easily enter our minds.

Now it is well worth noting that no one is an authority in everything. A successful manufacturer, whose ideas about manufacturing are the last word in scientific accuracy, may be wholly unreliable when he speaks on the subject of navigation or health insurance. Yet such is the power of prestige that his opinions on all subjects are received with deference—and as a result false sequences are transmitted to the minds of those who hear him.

The rule is a simple one: Trust an authority only in his own field; when he goes over to another field, be cautious and critical. In his own field the transmission will be valuable; in another it may be harmful.

The second factor in suggestion is the ignorance of the receiver. Here also the child is at the mercy of those around him. Since he knows little or nothing, his critical capacity can scarcely be said to exist. He accepts almost everything he is told, and can be brought to believe that fairies live in the garden or that the moon is made of green cheese.

But the ignorance of children is by no means the only ignorance that flourishes in the world. We are all of us ignorant in ten thousand respects, and gullible in every respect in which we are ignorant. There is no escape from this situation, because even the finest intelligence and the longest lifetime would not enable us to know more than a little of what is to be known.

These two factors—the prestige of the person who presents the idea, and the ignorance (in that field) of the person who receives the idea—are the basis of suggestion. There is, however, a third factor to note, namely the effect of constant repetition. A suggestion once made may quickly be forgotten, but a suggestion made over and over again engraves itself upon the mind. Advertising makes great use of this principle, and brings the same product to our attention in all possible ways. Education uses it in the form of drill or practice. Propaganda trusts to it enormously, and propagandists take every opportunity to impress their ideas on the public mind.

All in all, suggestion is the chief means of social conditioning, and, of course, the chief means of influencing public opinion. It operates largely outside the knowledge of the receiver, who learns without being aware that he is learning. Quite often it operates outside the knowledge of the giver, who is not aware that he is teaching. To this considerable extent it is an unwitting process. But there are, nevertheless, innumerable occasions on which it is used with intention and careful forethought—innumerable occasions on which the giver sets deliberately out to build up the content of the receiver's mind.

Very obviously, the value of suggestion lies entirely in the truth of the sequences it presents. Its danger lies in the ignorance of the receiver, and in a lack of accurate knowledge or in a prejudiced intention on the part of the giver. The difficulty, as you must see, is that sequences acquired through suggestion are not acquired as a result of the individual's own observation, and may have no counterparts in the actual world. The sequence, for example, A (walking under a ladder) — B (bad luck), with which a great many people are burdened, is one that simply does not occur in reality. Such sequences have resulted from faulty observa-



tion or sheer fancy in the first place, and have been transmitted to multitudes of uncritical people.

Every effort should be made to do three things: first, to realize the fact whenever a suggestion is made; second, to appraise the authority of the giver; and third, to assure yourself by personal observation that the sequence presented is one that actually occurs. Only by doing these three things can you build up a rational mind and protect yourself against error.

Consider the following case. Bob Davis has a friend called Bill Outerbridge whom he greatly admires. Bill frequently tells Bob about a wonderful society for psychical research to which he belongs, and offers as a special mark of favour to take him to one of the meetings. Bob very eagerly goes.

When he is ushered into the meeting-place, he finds the members dressed in long robes and sitting solemnly round

the room under subdued lights. Bob is a little frightened and much impressed. After a little while the leader, a young man with a sepulchral voice, addresses the gathering on the subject of spirit manifestations, and says among many other strange things that Bob's deceased grandfather would like to communicate with him. The lights are put out and a feeble voice addresses Bob in terms of affection and complaint. It exhorts him to be less flippant about the spirit world and to heed the teachings of the young man with the sepulchral voice. When the lights are turned on again, the members crowd around Bob and assure him that the spirit world has treated him with amazing good will and consideration. In due time the meeting breaks up and Bob goes home.

Now note the techniques of suggestion. First, Bob knows nothing whatever about mediumistic theories and practices. Second, the whole experience has been clothed in prestige and authority: Bob greatly admires Bill Outerbridge; he has been impressed by the long robes, the solemnity of the occasion, the personality of the leader, the voice purporting to be that of his dead grandfather; and he has been assured on all sides of his own talent for psychical research.

How easy it would be for Bob to accept the suggestion, and to establish a new and highly dubious sequence in his mind! Here it is—backed up by ignorance on the one side and prestige on the other: A (certain ceremonies) — B (communication with spirits of the dead) — C (guidance in regard to future action).

But Bob is a critical person. He goes home and thinks the matter through. First, he clearly realizes an effort has been made to influence his mind. Second, and after mature consideration, he doubts the authority of the society to instruct him about the spirit world. He feels the stage was too elaborately set, the scene too dramatically laid. Third,

he has never encountered a spirit in the world of actual experience, and the voice of his grandfather failed to carry conviction. So Bob decides to leave the society alone. He prefers to suspend judgment concerning spirit manifestations until such time as they occur under strictly scientific observation.

2. *Persuasion.* All the elements of suggestion enter also into persuasion, but one important element is added, namely, an appeal to reason. Sometimes the appeal to reason is more apparent than real, but it is always there. An effort is always made to relate the new sequence to sequences already in the receiver's mind.

It will be seen at once that in spite of the emphasis here on a process of thought, the stupid, ignorant or lazy person is at the mercy of the persuader. Persuasion is the most perfect means known to man for spreading truth and enhancing virtue, but it can also be used to disseminate error and to encourage vice. Like suggestion, it must be critically received and slowly accepted.

The technique is easily analysed. The new sequence is presented in terms of sequences already in the receiver's mind. It is shown to be in harmony with his mental content, and so to have a claim upon his acceptance. A new idea, you will remember, is accepted only when it is in agreement with ideas the individual has previously acquired.

By way of example, a certain person is strongly of the opinion that woman's place is in the home. He believes that when women go out into business and industry, the home breaks down, children are demoralized, and the fibre of the nation is weakened. The sequence is a well-established part of his mental content.

Now note the effect of this sequence upon his acceptance or rejection of new ideas on the subject. He is told that women have been immensely valuable in reinforcing the

war effort, that they are much better fitted for some kinds of work than men are, that many women have neither desire nor talent for home-making. To all these and similar arguments he replies with an angry snort and a warm declaration that no sensible man would give them a moment's consideration.

But if he is told that the entrance of women into business and industry has been followed by a sharp rise in juvenile delinquency totals and by a marked increase in the number of divorces, he is impressed at once. He accepts the statement as true without further question, and quotes the figures next day with every evidence of strong conviction.

It has already been mentioned that stupid, ignorant or lazy people are at the mercy of anyone gifted in the arts of persuasion. The smooth persuader can so dress up a new idea as to make it *seem in harmony* with those already held by the receiver. Stupid and ignorant people are easily deceived; lazy people do not trouble to be critical of what they hear and read.

The honest persuader, the man who presents a new sequence which has the virtue of being true, is in a different position. He has a final argument to offer, namely, that the sequence he supports *can be observed in the real world*. When other arguments fail, he is able to ask the receiver to observe the sequence for himself.

3. *Coercion*. Not much can be said for this. People can be compelled to conform, but they can scarcely be compelled to believe. The force behind coercion is the arousal of fear. Sometimes when fear is continuous and long-drawn-out, it can sear certain sequences into the mind, but the effect of such coercion is to produce abnormality and even insanity. In ordinary life, and certainly in democratic life, coercion of this kind has a very small place.

We come now to a discussion of the three main fields in which the influencing of public opinion operates, which are advertising, propaganda and education. Each of these deserves a section to itself. They are among the most obvious features of modern life, and demand your intelligent attention.

ADVERTISING

Advertising is an effort to influence public opinion toward the buying of certain products or toward some other form of behaviour that will benefit the advertiser. It is a perfectly proper and indeed indispensable way of calling attention to goods, services, entertainments, meetings, and things of the kind. It dates back into the far past of human history, and in our large-scale modern society it is more imperative than ever.

You will readily see the force of the last statement. This is the day of specialization and mass production in industry. A huge factory for the manufacture of a certain product is set up in a location where supplies of raw material, power, and skilled labour are available. The product is manufactured in enormous quantities, and must necessarily be sold far beyond the locality in which the factory is situated. A continental or even world market is required, and advertising is the only means of reaching it.

Advertising makes use of suggestion and persuasion, but more of the first than the second. The appeal is directed to our appetites and emotions rather than to our brains. Where reason is appealed to—by scientific statements about the product and its benefits to the user—the advertiser usually contents himself with very elementary and sketchy arguments, and emphasizes the emotional side.

Repetition, of course, is a great factor. By every possible device the product is kept before the public eye and its

virtues are reiterated. It becomes well known and widely purchased.

From the point of view of the public, everything depends on the honesty of the advertising. Suggestion and persuasion can be used to sell poor-grade as well as high-grade goods. Indeed, where goods are definitely inferior, they are sometimes advertised with even greater zeal. If there is one thing you must learn in defence of your own pocket to do, it is to regard all advertisements with critical discrimination. You must discount exaggerated claims and turn a cool eye on all sugary and romantic language. The part of wisdom is to find out by careful inquiry among your acquaintances just what the product is worth, and to buy it only when you are reasonably sure it will serve your purpose. If everyone were to do that, goods would improve and the public would reap a very considerable advantage.

PROPAGANDA

Propaganda has come to have a bad name. Whereas at one time the word was highly respectable and had to do with the spread of Catholicism, it is now rather sinister in meaning. Yet it is defined by Webster as 'any organized or concerted group effort or movement to spread a particular doctrine or system of doctrines or principles', and by the *Oxford Dictionary* as 'any association, systematic scheme, or concerted movement for the propagation of a particular doctrine or practice'.

Propaganda uses the techniques of suggestion and persuasion, and sometimes the coercion of fear. It may either be excellent in purpose and effect, or it may be animated by self-interest and harmful in outcome. Its frequent appearance in the latter guise has produced the general suspicion with which it is regarded.

According to the definition, both advertising and educa-

tion are forms of propaganda, though it is not usual to classify them that way. Truthful advertising and education directed by the democratic state are propaganda in the good sense of the word; deceptive advertising and subversive education are propaganda in the bad sense.

What kinds of propaganda then, are desirable and what kinds are not? The general answer is this: Those kinds of propaganda are desirable that remain within the limit of freedom accorded to the citizen, and those kinds are undesirable that pass over that limit either to undermine the state or to injure the individual.

You will recall that freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press are thoroughly established democratic rights. Within due bounds they can be exercised by everybody. But due bounds are set by law. If anyone oversteps them he can be prosecuted for treason, libel, slander or defamation of character. Propaganda, to be legal, must respect state authority and individual security.

In practice, undesirable propaganda is chiefly directed against the state, and is marked by measures that are intended to weaken the state in some respect. These measures are revolutionary in character. When applied in a democracy, they are a flouting of the public will and an effort on the part of a minority to force its doctrines on the majority.

Note, however, that temperate and legal propaganda—which confines itself to democratic methods and spreads no doctrines harmful to the state—is an excellent thing. It is our chief means of progress in the art of social living; for if new ideas were not permitted to be supported and spread, our society would soon decline.

During wartime, propaganda serves other purposes: it is used to undermine the morale of the enemy and to strengthen the home front. This, of course, you know very well. Censorship, which is propaganda in reverse, is di-

rected to the same ends. It has been found, in the British Commonwealth and America at least, that the best form of propaganda for home consumption is as much truth as can be made public without giving valuable information to the enemy. One point more regarding propaganda in wartime: treason is then a much more serious crime. The effort of any group to weaken the state by spreading subversive doctrines at such a time is utterly unpardonable.

EDUCATION

Like advertising and propaganda, education makes use of suggestion, and persuasion. It seeks, however, to emphasize the latter, and so develop the reasoning power of the student. It also, where necessary, makes use of coercion, but its coercion is exercised in the direction of socially imperative growth.

Note now the following points. The aim of education is to produce cultured and efficient citizens of the state it serves, and this aim varies to some extent from one country to another. The curricula of the school are controlled by the state, and in a democratic country they reflect the established will of the majority. Teachers are agents of the state, and their duty is to educate their students in accordance with majority will, and in keeping with the patterns of life and thought that characterize the state whose agents they are.

To be a little more definite, teachers are in duty bound to influence the minds of their students to support the morals, laws and institutions of the state to which their loyalty is owed. When they depart from their duty to put forth views—either openly or with subtlety—that run counter to the morals, laws and institutions of that state, they cease to be teachers and become propagandists of the baser sort. For in such a case they not only betray their trust, they also take mean advantage of people whose critical

powers are not fully developed and whose ability to protect themselves is consequently small.

AGENCIES OF INFLUENCE

We have now discussed the techniques through which public opinion is influenced (suggestion, persuasion and coercion), and the main fields (advertising, propaganda and education) in which such influence operates. It remains only to discuss the agencies by means of which the influence goes out upon the public mind.

Agencies are very numerous, but the most important of them can be listed as follows:

1. The Press—in which are included newspapers, books, magazines, pamphlets, bulletins and the like, that can be used to spread ideas.
2. The Public Address.
3. The Radio.
4. The Motion Picture.
5. Pictorial Illustration of All Sorts.
6. Entertainments and Displays.

A glance at the list will convince you that ideas reach us from almost all angles. Our critical power has to be awake most of the time! So incessant is the barrage of ideas upon our minds, it would be wonderful indeed if we acquired no erroneous ones. Most of the ideas are, of course, above reproach, but there are others—put forth by self-interested pressure groups—that have to be guarded against with the utmost alertness.

Let us briefly examine each item on the list.

1. *The Press*. This is probably the most powerful agency for the influencing of public opinion. It takes a thousand forms and is one of the leading features of our civilization. It does enormous good, as you need scarcely be told, by disseminating news, information, inspiration and entertain-

ment. But there is a strange magic about the printed word—many people believe everything they see in print; and these people are at the mercy of every editor and writer whose material they read. Now the sad truth is that editors and writers are often no wiser than other folk, but just have a better gift of expression. So the reader must keep his wits about him, and read with his brain as well as his eyes.

2. *The Public Address.* Before the advent of the radio, the public address was a more powerful mode of influencing public opinion than it is today. But it still retains a high prestige. You have only to think of our clergy, our political leaders, our lawyers and our professors to realize the fact. In all manner of societies and groups, the public speaker is listened to with pleasure and respect.

Further, there is a charm and inspiration in the living voice that cannot be infused into the written word, and an attractiveness about the living person that the radio cannot reproduce. In the gifted speaker, persuasion is at its height: he can sway his audience this way and that according to his pleasure. Therefore beware! Listen with your brain as well as your emotions.

3. *The Radio.* Today the radio rivals the press in its power to influence public opinion. It enters practically every home; its entertainment value is high; it can be listened to without charge. By addresses, news broadcasts, news commentaries and discussions, it presents all manner of ideas to the listener's mind; by music and drama it does much to form his taste. Moreover, most people listen more easily than they read.

Yet in spite of its advantages, the radio is handicapped in some respects. Its emphasis on advertising has taken away much of its authority. Written addresses delivered by an unseen speaker lose much of their appeal. Even music is impaired by mechanical reproduction.

When all has been said, however, the radio is a powerful agency of influence, and is likely to become more powerful as time goes on. Greater experience in its management, and the introduction of new inventions such as television, will broaden its effectiveness.

4. *The Motion Picture.* The main function of the motion picture is to provide entertainment, but news-reels and so-called 'documentaries' go over into the fields of information and instruction.

All pictures, however, convey ideas—often with a great deal of subtlety. An illustration of this is their influence on our attitudes toward various races. A picture having for its hero an exceptionally fine Chinese, let us say, has the effect of arousing greater sympathy and esteem for the Chinese people. This technique can work in reverse also, and arouse racial animosity. The point is worth remembering.

5. *Pictorial Illustration of All Sorts.* We learn very readily through the eye. Thus, as in the case of the motion picture, illustration profoundly influences public opinion. Its constant use in advertising is a proof of its power to do so.

Particularly note the cartoon. By means of the cartoon, ideas (and people for that matter) can be made to seem either excellent or ridiculous. It is used as a weapon in the field of politics. You need not be told of its deadly effect as an instrument of propaganda.

6. *Entertainments and Displays.* Human beings of all ages love to be entertained, and they will put up with a certain amount of instruction for the sake of the entertainment. Radio advertising is a good example of this fact. But entertainments and displays can instruct without seeming to do so. A concert can influence public taste; a physical culture display can stimulate the desire to be vigorous and athletic; a museum can arouse interest and direct thought.

These, then, are the six chief agencies of influence. As

has been pointed out, there are many others. The analysis, brief and simplified though it is, may have opened your eyes to the numerous ways in which the content of your mind is built up and your judgment controlled. Most influences are for good, but this is not so of them all. If, therefore, you wish to protect yourself against the acquiring of false sequences, you must constantly be alert in your own defence. You must scrutinize every idea presented to you, and endeavour by every means in your power to test its truth. Only after this critical scrutiny can you accept it with safety.

CHAPTER 30

OPERATING A DEMOCRACY

WE COME in this chapter to what is perhaps the most essential discussion of all. The questions to be answered are these: What exactly is a democracy? How is it operated? and, In what ways can we prepare ourselves to take a useful part in its operation? The answers we give to these questions have a profound bearing on everything we are and on everything we cherish.

Definitions of democracy are very numerous, and it may be of value to set not one but several of them down for your examination. Each of them is a view of the same idea from a different angle.

Webster defines democracy as 'government by the people; a form of government in which the supreme power is lodged in the hands of the people collectively'.

According to the *Oxford Dictionary*, democracy is 'government by the people; that form of government in which the sovereign power resides in the people, and is exercised either directly by them or by officers elected by them'. This authority also says, 'Democracy is a state or community in which the government is vested in the people as a whole', and adds that in modern usage democracy is a term 'often denoting a social state in which all have equal rights'.

Abraham Lincoln defined democracy in one of the noblest and most illuminating phrases coined by man, as 'government of the people, by the people, and for the people'.

One more definition—which has been used previously in this book—will round out the picture. Democracy is the

form of government in which the state sets deliberately out to satisfy all the reasonable needs of all the people.

In the light of these definitions, let us now examine the points that have been covered, and thereby get a complete view of the democratic idea.

1. In a democracy, the people govern themselves. They are ruled over neither by one man nor by a privileged few, but by the citizens collectively. Every citizen has an equal share in the function of government.

2. Where, as in modern society, the state is very large and it is not convenient for all the citizens to assemble, local representatives are elected to perform the governing function. These representatives, however, who under British law form what is called a parliament, are elected for a period not exceeding five years. Usually, parliament is dissolved well within that time, and another election is held. No representative, therefore, can remain long in parliament after he has lost the confidence of the electors. This is known as Representative Government.

3. Even a parliament is too large a body to plan and supervise the detailed task of ruling the country. In practice, a committee of the party that holds a majority in parliament becomes the Government, and is responsible to parliament for its policies and actions. The Prime Minister is at the head of this committee. If parliament disapproves of the policies and actions of the Government, it simply votes the Government down, and under ordinary circumstances another election is held. This is known as Responsible Government.

4. In a democracy, all citizens have equal rights. The citizen is protected in the enjoyment of these rights by the law and custom of the state of which he is a member. The same rights are guaranteed by the state to every citizen, and their violation is strictly punished.

5. Since all rights grow out of needs, and since democracy calls for the equal treatment of all citizens, it follows that the satisfaction of all the reasonable needs of all the people is the democratic goal. Democratic law-making therefore goes forward on this principle: it creates and enforces rights that are necessary to the satisfaction of general and reasonable needs.

The word 'reasonable' as used here calls for an explanation. A need is reasonable when it can be satisfied without interfering with the rights of other people.

6. A democracy may take more forms than one. In the United States it takes the form of a republic—a republic in which there is representative but not responsible government. In the British Commonwealth it takes the form of a limited monarchy, in which the emotional values but not the powers of kingship are retained, and in which both representative and responsible government are found. Democracy is not a set and final pattern of state organization; it is an evolving principle animated by the broad spirit of humanitarianism.

7. From the last statement it may be seen that democracy is in continuous process of development, and changes in form to keep pace with the changing circumstances of man's life. As man increases his material resources and extends his control of natural forces, the conditions of his life are altered; his needs become more numerous and more diversified, and the humanitarian principle must be applied in new ways. Democracy, therefore, whose purpose it is to satisfy all reasonable needs, must everlastingly be modified.

The very core of democracy is consideration for others. Democracy is the Golden Rule in action; and since new fields for the application of the Golden Rule are forever emerging, it follows that democracy must continue to evolve.

8. Democracy may be regarded as an evolving pattern of rights. In our society of today, the chief elements of the pattern are well established and may be set down as follows:

- (a) Protection of life and limb, of reputation, of personal liberty, and of property.
- (b) Freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of artistic expression, and of worship.
- (c) Free choice of work, and freedom to influence the conditions of work.
- (d) Representative and responsible government.
- (e) Equality before the law.
- (f) Free, universal education.

If you would compare totalitarianism with democracy, all you have to do is examine this pattern of rights point by point in reference to each. Under the Nazi rule of Germany, *every single one* of these basic guarantees was brutally violated or swept away.

Democracy, however, continues to evolve. New rights are even now being woven into its pattern, and can already be added to the list set down above. Here are three for your consideration:

- (g) The right to be gainfully employed, and in such work as is genuinely suited to the capacities and tastes of the individual.
- (h) The right to adequate subsistence at every stage and in every emergency of life—in childhood, in sickness, and in old age. This right, however, can apply only to such people as are unable to work: it cannot be extended to the lazy and shiftless. Perhaps the lazy and shiftless will be treated as proper subjects for re-education and rehabilitation through some form of institutional training.
- (i) The right to first-rate medical attention and hospitalization regardless of the individual's ability to pay.

9. Democracy is the only form of social organization completely in harmony with man's nature, since it is the only

one dedicated to the service of all his reasonable needs. In the words of De Tocqueville, "The progress of democracy seems irresistible, because it is the most uniform, the most ancient, and the most permanent tendency which is to be found in history."

10. The essence of democracy, its most perfect summing up, is to be found in a penetrating utterance of Solon, who lived in Athens more than two thousand five hundred years ago. "That is the most perfect government," he said, "under which a wrong to the humblest is an affront to all."

This, then, is democracy—the most equitable, the most just, the most moral, and the most flexible of all man's solutions to the age-old problem of social living. It is one of man's greatest achievements, and perhaps the one beyond all others that upholds his dignity and enlarges his happiness.

SELECTION OF LEADERS

We come now to the second question: How is a democracy operated? In answering this, we shall not deal with the machinery—the party system, platforms, elections, and the like. We shall do no more than note that in Canada, government is conducted at three levels: the federal, the provincial and the municipal; and that its function is carried out by a host of civil servants under the direction of the elected representatives of the people. Having noted this, we shall pass on at once to the strictly human side of the subject.

Democracy is operated by people, and depends for its efficiency on the experience, uprightness and wisdom of the people who operate it. Where, as in Canada, it is well established, where it rests on a long tradition of honour and good sense and has become the national way of life, it is reasonably secure against the encroachments of the knavish and the errors of the foolish. But such security is never complete. In course of time even the strongest and most



stable institution can be injured, if its control falls into the wrong hands.

To make the point clear, let us take the case of a chess club that flourished in a small but entirely satisfactory way for fifty years. A short while ago it came to an untimely end. How do you imagine this occurred?

The club had its quarters in a rather dingy room, up two flights of stairs in a building that had seen its best days. The membership was never large, but it had always been loyal and enthusiastic, and had included many fine players. So the club was strong in traditions and well established. It seemed quite likely to continue in its modest way for fifty years more.

Some two years ago, however, several men were elected to the committee who were determined to make drastic changes. They were inexperienced in the ways of chess clubs, and

immediately planned a new and much more elaborate place of meeting. In fact, they decided the club must have quarters of its own, and set about raising money for a suitable building. They increased membership fees and dunned the members to buy stock in the new venture. As a result, the membership soon dwindled down to the point where the club could no longer pay the rent of the room it already occupied, and had to close its doors.

Something similar to this has probably happened in your own experience. All institutions, great as well as small, are operated by people, and democracy is no exception.

Everything depends, therefore, on the men and women we elect to be our representatives. The matter is so supremely important, we shall do well to discuss it fully.

What qualities should we demand in those who seek to be our rulers? No one can give a complete answer to this question, but here are some qualities on which most thinking people agree:

1. Superior Intelligence.
2. Rationality.
3. Experience.
4. Integrity and Industry.
5. Power of Expression.

Let us examine the list with care, and see exactly what each item implies. To avoid being too theoretical, let us think of a certain Mr. John Smith who offers himself for election to parliament. How does he stand in regard to the five qualities mentioned? And how is his fitness or unfitness to be appraised? Keep John Smith in mind.

1. *Superior Intelligence.* It is surely axiomatic to say that the man who aspires to govern his fellows must be endowed with brains. Since he undertakes to solve problems of the higher order, he should have better than average

problem-solving power. Otherwise his solutions might be erroneous and harmful.

You are probably recalling the fact that intelligence can be measured. This is quite true in the case of a child, but in the case of an adult the matter is not so simple. Tests at the adult level for people with very different backgrounds are not too reliable, and candidates might take unkindly to the idea of measurement. All in all, scientific testing is not practicable in this situation.

What then? There is nothing for it but to estimate John Smith's intelligence through a careful scrutiny of his life. How has he solved the problems that have come his way? What do his friends and business associates think of his ability? Do his speeches indicate that he is an intelligent man? Does he propose any shrewd and enlightened solutions to the problems that face the country, or does he merely utter the slogans and repeat the general platform of his party?

2. *Rationality.* We now come to the content of John Smith's mind and the sequences that make it up. It is vitally important to know if these sequences are false or true. If many of them are false—if he expects things to happen that do not so occur in the real world—he will lead us into trouble.

The greatest source of irrationality in the field of government is fanaticism. When certain sequences, which themselves may be true or false, dominate a man's mind to the point where other sequences are minimized or excluded, that man's judgment cannot be trusted. He cannot help but take a one-sided view of every question to which he addresses his mind. Every idea he accepts must correspond to the system of ideas for which he has a fanatical devotion, and all other considerations are left blindly out of account.

If John Smith is a fanatic, it will be a good deal wiser

to refuse him your vote. But how are you to know? The only sure way to find out is to make a personal study, to attend one or two of his meetings or to listen carefully to his radio addresses. If his mind comes continually back to one set of ideas, if he is unable to perceive a shred of truth in any other ideas, if he becomes passionate and a little incoherent, then you will have ample proof of his fanaticism. But if he is a man of moderate temper, who presents his ideas with conviction yet without claiming them to be the only possible ideas on the subject, and whose whole point of view is infused with strong common sense, you will know him to be rational and reliable.

3. *Experience.* You will remember that problem-solving calls not only for intelligence but also for *experience in the field of the problem*. Even the most intelligent and otherwise rational man will fail unless he has acquired the sequences necessary to the solution of the particular problem he is facing. If he is to be successful in solving economic problems, he must have experience in the field of economics; if he is to be an effective leader, he must have experience in leadership.

The bane of politics is that people seek election despite the fact that their sole experience has been in some other and quite unrelated field. They are led by ambition to tackle problems for whose solution they are wholly unequipped. The easiest road to prominence in a democracy is through politics, and such people are eager to take it.

The suggestion has frequently been made that all candidates should receive training and reach a satisfactory standard in certain essential subjects before they are allowed to offer themselves for election. The course, it is suggested, should be at the university level, and should include such subjects as politics, economics, psychology and sociology. This idea, though an excellent one, is not practicable at our

present stage of social development. There are many men and women whose ordinary experience has fitted them very well for leadership, yet whose indifferent schooling would be a bar to their success in the course mentioned. The day may come when such essential training is demanded, but it must wait until our system of education develops every individual to the fullest extent of his powers.

Meantime, you must judge John Smith's experience for yourself. You have no alternative but to inquire into his record, to acquaint yourself with the work he has done, and to note the success he has achieved. If he has done nothing of any account—except perhaps talk—you will know how to treat him on election day. If, on the other hand, you find his experience has been wide and successful, and also relevant to the problems a representative is called upon to solve, you will be able to give his candidature your earnest consideration.

4. *Integrity and Industry.* We are here dealing with John Smith's character. It is scarcely necessary to labour the point that if he lacks character, none of his other qualities can make up the lack. In fact, the more able and experienced he is, the worse it will be for the people he represents.

Pressures of many sinister and self-interested sorts are brought to bear on our representatives. Special concessions and financial baits are dangled before their eyes. All they have to do is whisper a little inside information or lend their support to some innocent-looking measure. When you remember that most representatives are anything but rich and that they are never sure of re-election, you will see the strength of the temptations to which they are subject. Integrity, therefore, is imperative.

But industry is also essential. It is fatally easy for a representative to sit back and do little or nothing. No one forces him to study the questions that come before him; no one

compels him even to speak if he has a mind to remain silent. All he has to do is vote with the other members of his party on any issue that comes up. He can take his ease and concentrate on looking wise.

What then, about John Smith? There is, alas, no certain way of appraising his character. Again you must examine his record, find out what you can about his private and business reputation, and reach a decision for yourself.

5. *Power of Expression.* It is on this basis that men and women are most commonly elected to office. The fluent speaker, especially when he is practised in the art of touching emotion and arousing passion, has a tremendous advantage over other people. He can sway the multitude and bend it to his will.

The truth is that power of expression is probably the least significant of the five qualities we have listed—yet it is the most influential. It is a weakness of our democracy that the things important to a man's election—his eloquence and personal charm—are not the things that make him the best representative. Many a man, otherwise highly qualified for the tasks of government, is passed over because of his halting speech.

All this, however, is by no means to say that the gift of clear and moving expression is of small consequence. It most emphatically is not. Indeed, in the upper reaches of leadership it is indispensable, and no man can be a statesman in the great sense without it.

In this one particular, John Smith can be appraised without difficulty. You have only to hear him. But before passing final judgment on his claim to election, you will be well advised to remember that his power of expression is only one of the qualities on which you should base your decision.

Here, in closing the second part of the chapter, is a practical suggestion. Apply these five standards to the outstand-

ing statesman of yesterday and today. There is material for an interesting, informative discussion in relating them to the great leaders of history and the eminent men who direct affairs in our own time.

PREPARATION FOR LEADERSHIP

Our third and last question is this: In what ways can we prepare ourselves to take a useful part in the operation of a democracy? It is a vastly important question, as you see at once, and one that demands a straightforward answer.

Let us begin with two quotations, by way of directing the discussion. There is a central idea here, as in most matters, and it is necessary you should grasp it.

In the Parable of the Talents, the following words appear: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things."

Sir Walter Raleigh, who possessed an exalted mind and great insight, put the idea this way, "A man must first govern himself ere he is fit to govern a family; and his family ere he be fit to bear the government of the commonwealth."

From these clear-sighted and simple statements one fact emerges, namely, that real ability in leadership can be gained only through practice. In order to be qualified to direct great organizations, you must first have directed small ones; if you aspire to be a leader, you must first fit yourself by thoughtful co-operation to assist in directing the little societies or clubs to which you belong.

It is an extremely valuable feature of the democratic way of life that minor institutions of all sorts abound. Almost everyone is a member of some organization, however small and unimpressive, and thus has an opportunity to gain experience in democratic modes of action and in democratic leadership. Almost everyone is some time or other elected

to a committee, or asked to prepare a report, or placed in a temporary position of authority. In a democracy there is no excuse for a man to hide his light under a bushel—in fact, there is not much chance of his doing so.

It sounds rather paradoxical to say the way to leadership is through leadership, yet such is the case. The whole matter is one of degree, the lesser being preparatory to the greater. There remains, however, this question to answer: What are the qualities that make for effective leadership in the first place? Or to put it personally: What qualities will make you an acceptable member of a Students' council, or bring about your election to the committee of a dramatic club, or direct attention to you as a possible leader in some sort of group activity?

Obviously enough, they will be the qualities we looked for in John Smith, which were: intelligence, rationality or common sense, relevant experience, integrity and industry, and power of expression. If you have these, your path will be easy; if you have not, then you must take all possible steps to acquire them. Even if you have them, the great probability is they are capable of immense development and improvement.

There is, however, one other quality you must possess—a quality we took for granted in the case of John Smith—namely, efficient followership. If you lack this, your career will be over before it begins!

Now there is nothing humiliating, as some people falsely imagine, about being a follower. Most of us are cast chiefly in the role of follower all through our lives. You will meet with a thousand situations in which some other person—often quite a humble person—is very much more experienced and better qualified to lead than you are.

The fundamental thing about operating a democracy is that everyone must do, to the best of his ability, the thing

he is best fitted to do. Sometimes he must lead, and sometimes he must follow; but always he must contribute his full share.

Since followership is so vital a quality, let us examine it and make a brief analysis. What are its component parts? They would seem on consideration to be these: absence of self-conceit; ability to take criticism and direction; willingness to co-operate; sense of social responsibility; and capacity for work.

First, then, there is absence of self-conceit. The type of person who must always lead and can never subordinate himself to another, is no democrat but an autocrat. The thing that happens to him is that he is left severely alone. He is soon marked off in everybody's mind as a childish creature quite unfit for mature society.

Second, there is ability to take criticism and direction. No one can know everything or be an 'all-round specialist'; everyone has to learn. Criticism, therefore, is not only useful but necessary. It should be regarded as a proper means to our education; and when it is given with good will, it is so regarded by all sensible people. The need for direction is also obvious. One person must be at the helm to supervise and co-ordinate the activities of the group.

Third, we come to willingness to co-operate. This is democracy in its lowest terms. The unco-operative person is one of four things: he is socially diffident and weighed down by a sense of inferiority; or he puts an absurd value on his own importance; or he selfishly prefers his own interest to that of the group to which he belongs; or he is bone lazy. In the first event he needs treatment, in the last three he needs discipline.

Fourth, there is sense of social responsibility, and this is something very slowly acquired by most people. It grows out of insight into common needs and purposes, and ac-

companies the steady development of self-respect. It implies trustworthiness, punctuality and a stable outlook, and is greatly valued by society. Indeed, the person whose sense of social responsibility is well known, is regarded as a pillar of strength and a splendid candidate for leadership.

Fifth and last is the capacity for work, without which neither a follower nor a leader is of much account. Far too often in our democratic society we find this capacity lacking. For example, five men are elected to a committee, and one of them does all the work while the other four stand idly by. Democracy cannot be operated efficiently on such a basis.


To sum up: a democracy, however excellent in principle, is no better than the people who compose it. It is operated by the citizens, and its success or otherwise depends on the qualities they bring to the task. If, therefore, you wish your country to be a happy and prosperous place, you must do these two things: you must yourself be a democratic citizen in the widest sense of that term; and you must choose your representatives with the most scrupulous and discriminating care.

CHAPTER 31

UNDERSTANDING OTHER PEOPLES

LET us set off in this chapter by gathering together a few of the conclusions we have arrived at in earlier discussions. The best way to do so will be to put them down point by point in a definite list. With these reminders, we shall be able to go confidently on to discuss the subject in hand.

1. There are no racial differences between new-born babies except in their physical appearance.
2. All ideas and skills, without exception, are learned.
3. Brought up from infancy in any nation—if skin colour,



facial features, hair texture and the like are entirely ignored—any baby will acquire the cultural characteristics of that nation.

4. We ourselves, being conditioned to our own culture and having acquired the sequences it commonly presents, tend to regard all other cultures and their appropriate sequences with a somewhat disapproving eye. We tend to think of our own ideas and customs as right and of all others as wrong.

5. This quite natural but quite illogical attitude is apt to make us suspicious of foreigners as well as contemptuous of their ways. It is the great barrier to our understanding of other peoples.

* * * * *

From this summary certain definite facts emerge, and they will serve as a reliable guide in the discussion we are now about to enter. First, it is clear that all human beings are much the same beneath the skin. Second, we can be sure that differences between peoples are not due to stubbornness or stupidity or depravity, but only to environmental and historical factors. Third, there is no doubt we can understand other peoples very well indeed if we will make the necessary intellectual effort.

For illustration of these facts, let us consider the following case: Jim Anderson, a young Canadian brought up in Vancouver, is sent by his employers to live for a few years in China as their representative. He knows next to nothing about the Chinese. In fact, his only contact with them has been connected with buying vegetables. He is dimly aware they are an ancient and dignified people, but the Chinese he has seen have not impressed him that way.

During his first few months in China, Jim is out of all patience with the Chinese. He cannot understand their

speech, he is contemptuous of their dress, their food, and their dwellings; he deplores their congested and unsanitary conditions of life; he is frustrated at every turn by their leisurely way of doing business. All in all, he thinks of the Chinese as a queer, incomprehensible and rather unintelligent race.

But after a while, he begins to make a few friends. He settles determinedly down to learn the language, and finds himself in a new position. The fact slowly dawns on him that the ways of China are derived from her physical environment and history, that they are the natural outcome of age-long conditions her people have had to face. Then Jim is lucky enough to meet an old Chinese gentleman who treats him with great kindness, and he learns many things about Chinese achievement and philosophy. His criticism turns to admiration, and he becomes an enlightened and enthusiastic supporter of all things Chinese. He numbers many Chinese men and women among his intimate friends; and when at last he is recalled to Canada, he leaves China with genuine reluctance.

Now the story of Jim Anderson has been duplicated many millions of times in the history of the world, and it will be duplicated many millions of times more. The key to understanding other peoples is simply to live with them on terms of friendship. The intellectual process follows.

Having laid down the general principle, let us return to item five of the summary with which the chapter began, and come to closer grips with the point at issue. The item contains two statements: first, we are conditioned to our own culture and have acquired the sequences it commonly presents; and second, we tend to regard all other cultures and their appropriate sequences with disapproval. Each of these statements must be carefully examined.

First, then, there is our own conditioning. We have gone

into this matter in considerable detail before, but a few specific illustrations will clarify your mind. The following four will be sufficient for the purpose.

Consider language. We learn to speak from those around us, and certain sounds come to have certain meanings. Every word becomes a reliable part of many sequences. When we say, "Please pass the butter," we *expect* a definite piece of behaviour to follow. We *expect* a word to be pronounced in a definite way, to be arranged among other words in a definite order, and to evoke a definite response.

Consider food. We acquire our habits of eating and our preferences for various kinds of food entirely from our environment and its resources. We *expect* our friends to eat in certain ways and to partake of certain foods. We *expect* our tomato juice to be served first and our dessert last.

Take the matter of courtesy. We have been trained to treat people in certain considerate ways, and have come as a result of our experience to *expect* them to treat us in similar fashion. We have acquired definite sequences of greeting and conversing and parting. We have learned to govern our emotions, to appear cheerful, and to exercise tact in awkward situations. Our manners are a part of us, and we *expect* the manners of other people to be like our own—in fact, we talk disgustedly about 'boorishness' and 'poor breeding' when they are not.

Take for a last illustration the matter of attitude. We are brought up to support certain attitudes and condemn others. For instance, we believe democracy to be the finest form of government; we are strongly of the opinion that science is a great boon to humanity; we think women should be treated with consideration and respect; we take the view that everyone should receive an education; and we uphold the idea that we are lucky to have been born into the British Commonwealth of Nations. These attitudes are so well

established in our minds and their truth—to us—is so crystal-clear, we *expect* all other people to possess them too.

Let us turn now to the statement that we tend to disapprove of cultures and their appropriate sequences that differ from our own. The behaviour of foreigners *disappoints our expectation*, and leaves us with a sense either of injury or absurdity: it either irritates us or makes us laugh. We are irritated because our customary sequences fail to occur and we are at a loss how to behave; or we laugh because the sequences used by the foreigner strike us as incongruous.

We meet, for instance, a young Arab who has been sent to our country to be educated. He comes of highly-connected and well-to-do people, and is a splendid representative of his race. His use of English, however, is very indifferent. The constructions are strange and his pronunciations peculiar. We are for ever repressing the urge to correct him and the impulse to laugh at his mistakes.

We invite him to dinner, and are pained to discover there are foods he does not care to eat—good nourishing foods too, as they seem to us. His manners we find a little overwhelming, and may regard them as being in rather poor taste; but we are completely taken aback when he drinks his coffee in noisy gulps.

But it is when we begin to talk intimately that the real trouble comes. The Arab shares scarcely any of our attitudes. He is by no means enthusiastic about democracy; he does not share our simple faith in science; he believes in the complete subjection of women; he is quite against the principle of universal education; and he has his own opinion of the British Commonwealth of Nations. To add a few more contrary attitudes: he is a devout Mohammedan; he has no interest in Occidental games; he can find no merit in Occidental music; and he thinks Arabia the finest country in the world.

What then? Shall we for these reasons dislike him, or shall we try to account for the differences between us? Which is the intelligent thing to do? Remember there are many Arabs in the world, and your decision may have far-reaching consequences.

Consider the matter calmly and steadily. His English is no worse than your Arabic would be if the situation were reversed. His choice of food is the outcome partly of Arabian resources and partly of Arabian religion. His rather exaggerated manners are necessary in a country where the slightest hint of insult is mortally resented. His way of drinking coffee is intended to be the height of courtesy—and it is due to the fact that desert conditions in much of Arabia make hospitality an essential virtue, and the guest must show his warm appreciation. His attitudes are in strict accordance with Arabian custom and outlook, and these again are derived from Arabian environment and history.

To what conclusions does such a consideration bring you? Surely to this: the Arab is the product of his conditioning; his customs and attitudes are as fitting to his country as yours are to your country; his behaviour is strange only because it has been removed from its natural setting.

This reasoning applies to the inhabitants of every country under the sun, and even to semi-isolated groups living under the same national government. Every sort of behaviour, whether familiar or unfamiliar, has a cause that can be sought after and found. The ideas and customs of the Eskimo, or the Mexican, or the Polynesian, or the Zulu, or the Hindu—all these can be accounted for and respected by the man of rational mind.

It was said earlier in the chapter that the key to understanding other peoples is to live with them on terms of friendship. This, of course, is a counsel of perfection, because it is obviously impossible for us to live everywhere in

the world. What can be done in actual practice? These things at least.

We can cultivate the friendship of the foreigners we meet, and try to see the world through their eyes as well as our own. We can be interested in their background and tolerant of their ways. If we do this, we shall come at last to see that to be different is not necessarily to be wrong.

Secondly, we can be keenly alive to everything that has to do with other peoples. We can question travellers, read books, and observe motion-pictures. We can make it one of our hobbies to gather information on life as it is lived in distant places, and to interpret the information in terms of geographical and other conditions.

Thirdly, we can travel with our minds wide open whenever the opportunity comes our way. We can look at other cultures without prejudice, regard other races with sympathy, and enrich our own knowledge of the forces that shape human life.



Having now dealt with the main problem of understanding other peoples, we can turn to a few of the minor problems that remain to be solved. These have to do with certain widely held ideas that bar the way to complete understanding, and it may be said of them at the outset that they are based far more on badly informed opinion than on science.

THE RACE SUPERIORITY IDEA

First—and perhaps worst—is the idea that certain races are superior to others. This, of course, is part of the Nazi doctrine, and has been very thoroughly exploded by scientific research. But in spite of reason, it still continues to exercise a powerful influence over many minds. Perhaps

even you yourself have a small tendency to look down on other races, and to regard your own as of slightly better clay.

Why does such an unsound theory continue to flourish? Probably the main reason is that there are great differences in scientific knowledge and technological advancement among the races of man. Some races have brought the control of natural resources and power to an amazing pitch of efficiency; others are still very largely at the mercy of their physical environment. As a result, we are prone to regard the latter as incompetent creatures with neither brains nor ambition.

The thing we fail to remember is that our own ancestors were just such people no longer than two thousand years ago, and that the civilized men of Greece and Rome no doubt looked down upon them with equal superiority. Who could have foretold at that time that certain tribes of barbarians, without the least tincture of science, would one day build a mightier civilization than that of Rome itself?

Another reason, such as it is, is our profound satisfaction with everything familiar to us. This is due to conditioning, and has already been discussed. We are liable to imagine that any way of life that differs from our own is definitely inferior. In making a scale, we place our own ideas and practices at the top, and estimate the status of all other peoples in comparison with them. Needless to say, the result of this measurement is always very favourable!

THE RACE STEREOTYPE IDEA

A second idea barring the way to complete understanding is the notion that members of each race have a certain standard set of characteristics. While this is true enough on the purely physical side, it is an absurd exaggeration on the mental.

The believer in racial characteristics of the mental sort

looks out on a strangely simplified world. To him, all Englishmen are self-satisfied, all Scotsmen are mean, all Irishmen are witty, all Welshmen can sing; all Americans brag, all Frenchmen are polite, and all Chinese are industrious.

When the idea is worked out in more detail, it is even more ridiculous: Thus, a Scotsman—in addition to being mean—is characterized as follows: He lives on porridge and haggis, drinks nothing but whisky, wears a kilt, plays the bag-pipes, has a romantic attachment for Prince Charlie, reads no poet but Burns, is strictly religious, possesses great shrewdness in business, tosses the caber, and brings in the New Year with strange ceremonies. This is the Scottish stereotype—and describes no Scotsman on the face of the earth!

There is a stereotype (a standard set of characteristics) for every race. Consider the American Negro. According to widely held opinion, he has a childlike mind, uses a razor on his enemies, leads a lazy, shiftless life, is a devoted servant, sings spirituals in close harmony, works as a pullman porter, lives in a shanty, and has a passion for watermelons. A truly remarkable pattern!

What truth is there in the stereotype idea? There is some, of course, or it would never have come into existence. The grain of truth arises from the fact that a race of people, living under the same geographical and climatic conditions and facing the same social problems, does develop certain characteristics more than others. But within every race there are tremendous differences, and these differences make any stereotype quite misleading. Furthermore, the great tendency in the world of today is for environments and problems to become more and more alike, with the result that racial stereotypes are becoming more and more false. If, therefore, you are going about with any notions of the sort, you

had better discard them as promptly as possible. Their chief effect is to warp your judgment.

RACE PREJUDICE

The third idea that beclouds our understanding of other peoples is the notion that certain races are inherently vicious or hostile or internationally untrustworthy. It is closely related to the two ideas we have already discussed, but it has an important element of its own, namely, powerful emotion. This element is probably the greatest of all hindrances to the development of a rational and friendly world.

It will be well to look at the word 'inherently' with a careful eye. No one is born vicious or hating anybody or dishonourable. No one is born a criminal. Ideas and attitudes and practices are without exception learned. Therefore the doctrine that any races are 'inherently' debased in character is quite unfounded.

This is not to say, of course, that the members of a race—perhaps even the majority—cannot *become* debased. The plain fact is that they sometimes do. Difficult conditions of life, wicked leadership, and distorted education can brutalize a people beyond the power of words to describe. Such a series of events has occurred in our own time and in our very sight.

The point is this, however. Debased character is not transmitted by heredity—it is acquired by evil training. Thus the brutalizing or demoralizing of a race is not permanent, and indeed can be eradicated in the course of one or two generations.

There is, therefore, real justification for regarding a race as vicious *over a limited period of time*, and for attempting by all possible means to curb its destructive tendencies. In brief, there is real justification for war. But there is no justification for condemning a race for all time. Such a

condemnation would imply that evil factors are being handed down in the ancestral stock—which they are not.

We come now to the element of powerful emotion, the hatred or fear or distrust aroused in ourselves when we think of certain races. Usually these races have *some time in the past* given reason for us to feel about them as we do, but in most cases they are giving reason no longer. We have acquired our aversion to them from racial traditions that have been passed on to us by prejudiced members of our own race.

¶ You will see there are two distinct attitudes to be taken account of here: the attitude to peoples who are now giving cause for stern disapproval; and the attitude to peoples whose ancestors may have done so. In the first case we must use all decent means—emotional as well as physical—to protect ourselves, and we must not stop until we have eradicated criminality in the people concerned; but in the second place we must resolutely cleanse our own minds of hatred and suspicion. To put the point simply, it is reasonable to take steps for the punishment and correction of a man who injures us himself, but it is unreasonable to hound a man because his great-grandfather is reported to have been a rogue.

Race prejudice, then, is not an attitude temporarily adopted as a protection against some people who are *now* causing us distress and injury. It is an attitude permanently adopted against some people who may *in the past* have been deserving of it. In a word, it is unjustifiable malice.



There is no need, in closing this chapter, to exhort you to make a genuine effort to understand other peoples. The facts speak for themselves. At least you are clearly aware of the chief causes of misunderstanding, and can recognize


them when you examine your own mind. Unscientific ideas on the race question are just another case of false sequences, and they are typical of much of the irrationality that befogs the world.

CHAPTER 32

THE GOOD LIFE

A LAST chapter can be used for many purposes: to emphasize points already made; to crowd in things that have been forgotten; to reach notable conclusions; or to enable the writer to take his graceful leave. None of these endings will be attempted here. Instead, we shall choose for our final subject 'The Good Life', and conclude on a philosophical note.

What is meant, you may ask, by the Good Life? The question may best be answered in the words of a very old



man who lay dying. He turned with a smile to those who stood sadly about his bedside and said, "Don't mourn for me—I've had a good life. I've had true friends, a great deal of happiness, my share of success, and perhaps a little wisdom. I've enjoyed every year of it, and now I'm ready to go."

Nothing could be finer than the old man's brief summary of the things that make life worth while; and as we examine it, we shall see it brings everything said in this book to a sharp focus. For the whole end of understanding is to live richly in ourselves and harmoniously with our society; the outcome of thought should be intelligent action.

This chapter, then, will deal with five topics that go to the root of the broad problem of living. Philosophical though they may be, they are practical too.

YOUTH AND THE WORLD

No one knows for certain when the best time of life occurs, but most opinions greatly favour youth. In youth there is the fullest awareness of physical vigour and the warmest kindling of emotion. It is a period that lacks only experience and wisdom to make it perfect. Indeed, a cynic once remarked that youth is far too delightful a thing to waste on the young!

There are those, of course, who prefer other ages. For example, forty has been chosen, and the reason has been given that the man of forty touches both sides of life—he retains much of the vigour of youth and combines with it some of the wisdom of age. The truth of the matter is probably this: each period of life has its own felicity, and there is nothing to prevent us from savouring them all. You will find, if your life is normally happy, you will never be willing to go back a year—the age you happen to be will always be the best.

To return to youth, however, it must be admitted there are a few disadvantages in being young. They exist chiefly because there is so much to learn. You probably have a long list of disadvantages in mind! But we shall here look only at two—two that in all likelihood have not yet greatly troubled you. One is the cold plunge you will soon take into the outside world; and the other is your strong feeling that your ancestors and elders have got things into a dreadful muddle.

Consider the first. All your life through, you have been loved and shielded by your parents. You have been watched over by your teachers with more affection than you perhaps realize. You have been the centre of solicitude and attention, and your well-being has held high importance in the minds of others. You could be excused for imagining this desirable state of affairs will continue.

If you are not forewarned you may have a rude awakening. The world of business can be a very cold place, and strangers can be very indifferent. From being the centre of attention, you may find yourself on the outside fringe. Especially is this true if you go away from home to a city in which you have few acquaintances—no one will greatly care whether you sink or swim.

This is only a phase, of course, though it is a hard one to bear. In due time you will have made your own place in the world and your own home. It will all come out right in the end.

Now consider the second. Ever since the dawn of human history two things have been happening: age has looked with disapproval on the changing habits of youth, and youth has looked with disapproval on the views and practices of age. One of the oldest Egyptian documents is a severe criticism of the youth of that time; and probably the young

caveman was annoyed by the old-fashioned notions of his father.

These attitudes are largely due, as you already know, to the fact that in each generation the ways of the last are modified, that the young are conditioned by a world slightly different from the one that conditioned their parents. Thus, in the eyes of youth, things have always been in a muddle. They have always been arranged in terms of a passing order—even to some extent in terms of an order long past—and they are constantly in need of revision. Institutions change very slowly: there is an unavoidable lag between the development of new ideas and their acceptance into the common life.

But it is the glory of youth to take up the problems of the world with fresh vigour and zeal. As each generation crusades forward in turn, it sweeps away some of the outmoded patterns of human behaviour—and the result is progress. The frustrating feature, from youth's point of view, is that all outmoded patterns cannot be swept away and a new earth established. "And why not?" you ask a little bitterly. Because many seemingly outmoded patterns still have an essential use you are not yet in a position to perceive, and because human behaviour changes only by gradual evolution. The great matter is that evolution does steadily go on. The part played by youth is to lend enthusiasm and energy to the process.

FRIENDSHIP

We turn now to the old man's summary of the things that make up the Good Life. The first is friendship, and to this we shall for a little while give our thoughtful consideration.

Among the sources of human satisfaction, friendship holds a high place. It is founded on our need for companionship,

and without it we are poor indeed. Solitude, though everyone is the better for being alone from time to time, is not a condition we can long endure. Our hearts soon yearn for the society of others, and for the quickening of interest that society brings.

Our first friends are provided by nature, and usually they are the truest and best friends we ever have. When all others fail, we can turn with confidence to the members of our family. No one, it is said, can take the place of one's father and mother, and in a deep sense this is true. There is something in parenthood that loves and trusts in spite of disappointment, and carries right through to the end of the road.

Next to the powerful ties of family, our finest friendships are formed in youth. Those formed later in life are rarely as close. It is easy to see why this is so. In youth our friends see us as we are, they know our faults as well as our virtues, they enter the secret places of our mind. We talk intimately with them, and they with us; and a thousand common associations bind us together.

Some of the friendships we form afterwards may be enduring too, especially when they are based on mutual interests and daily companionship, but it is rare that they approach the friendships of youth either in depth or in completeness of understanding. When we leave youth behind, we leave much of our frankness behind. We become more self-sufficient and reserved. We are not so much given to baring our hearts and revealing our true nature. Experience of life has borne in upon us the wisdom of keeping our own counsel and ploughing our own furrow.

Perhaps you have sometimes wondered why it is you have so few intimate friends. Of many scores of acquaintances you have chosen only one or two to be your near companions. The reason for this is not far to seek. You cannot

open your heart to everyone; you cannot receive the unre-served confidences of everyone. Such a course would exhaust both your emotions and your patience. So you select—unwittingly for the most part—one or two kindred spirits to be your familiar friends, and admit all others to a lesser degree of your affection.

Do not analyse your family or your friends too keenly—close your eyes to some of their faults, and dwell upon their virtues. This may seem strange advice to be given in this book, where so much stress has been placed on analysis and clear insight. Yet, in the case of those nearest and dearest to us, it is the part of wisdom. We have no need to protect ourselves against those who hold us in love—our obligation is to protect them. We need to understand them chiefly that we may bring added comfort and happiness to their lives, not that we may enhance our own.

HAPPINESS

One of the oldest wishes in the world is for 'health, wealth and happiness'. The American Constitution places 'the pursuit of happiness' among the most fundamental rights of man. Everyone desires to be happy. How, then, is happiness to be achieved?

On analysis, happiness rests first of all on a reasonable satisfaction of needs. Physical well-being is highly important, because pain, hunger and exposure are great enemies of happiness. The question was once asked, "Could a good man be happy even on the rack?" and the answer was given, "He would have to be a *very* good man—or it would have to be a *very* bad rack!"

Not only is the satisfaction of physical needs important, social needs must also be served. Without significance, security, companionship and insight, happiness cannot be attained. While mild frustration is a challenge and a spur.

severe and prolonged frustration crushes the spirit. In order to be happy, then, we must satisfy all the reasonable claims of our nature.

It is worth recalling here—if such a reminder is necessary—that the great strength of democracy lies in the fact that it harmonizes the resources and conditions of the world with the essential nature of man.

Happiness is not altogether derived, however, from the present satisfaction of needs. Lively anticipation of such an outcome is often an even richer source of our felicity. We are never done looking forward, and letting our minds dwell happily on joys in prospect. Not only hope, but blissful hope ‘springs eternal in the human breast’. Our imagination conjures up delightful pictures of the future; it smooths over the rough places on the road we are travelling; it sustains our endurance and warms our ambition. Life would be a poorer thing if we lived only today and not yesterday and tomorrow. A large part of the happiness of youth is in the expectation of things to come; a large part of the happiness of age is in the recollection of things past.

The question of a scale of happiness has often been raised. What sources, it is asked, are the finest and most lasting? The question will never be finally answered, because different people find their greatest felicity in different ways. Where one man experiences his deepest enjoyment at a symphony concert, another is happiest when reading a book, or conversing with his friends, or watching a baseball game.

All that can be said is this. For most of us the chief sources of happiness are family life, friendship, congenial work and suitable relaxation. Beyond these things—to quote an old saying—‘happiness is where you find it’.

One word more. A cheerful manner, a ready smile, an attentive ear and a sympathetic heart will bring happiness

to those around you. Cultivate these, and your own happiness will not be far behind.

SUCCESS

According to one of the older English authors, Owen Feltham, "The greatest results in life are usually attained by simple means and the exercise of ordinary qualities. These may for the most part be summed up in these two—common sense and perseverance." To put the latter part of the quotation in the words we have been using in this book: success depends on rationality and honest work. Accurate thinking and strenuous doing are the bases of its genuine attainment.

Perhaps you are saying to yourself that many people have attained success by very different means—by birth, by good luck, even by sheer rascality. If your thoughts are running that way, we had better take some pains to find out exactly what success is. Otherwise we shall be beating the air.

First of all it is worth noting that 'importance' and 'greatness' are words with very different meanings. The world is full of important men, but great men are few. Importance is derived from position, money or power; greatness has its roots in the service of mankind. The man who can truly be called great is one who has had a permanent and ameliorating influence upon human life. He is one who by his scientific discoveries, his artistic achievements, or his philosophical insight, has enduringly improved the lot of all.

Success, then, has two sides. It can be personal or social. The first variety comes of our reaching some degree of importance; the second comes of our reaching one of the many levels of greatness. Everything depends on the nature of the choice we make. It is quite possible to be eminently successful in one, and at the same time to fail hopelessly

in the other. One can become rich, powerful and selfish; and one can become poor, insignificant and selfless.

The choice, of course, is not as dramatic as that, and there is no reason for going to either extreme. Here, as in most places, there is a way of moderation—a Golden Mean. The best success is twofold: it includes both self and society. It combines the reasonable satisfaction of our personal needs with the effectual betterment of the society in which we live. It brings us a share of importance, and also a portion—however small—of greatness.

Here, to stir your ambition and stimulate your efforts, is a closing remark: "Genius is one part inspiration and nine parts perspiration."

WISDOM

Wisdom is the most fitting subject with which to end this book, for it is the thing we have been discussing from first to last. Wisdom truly lies in understanding ourselves and our society: we have attained it when we have acquired practical insight into human nature.

Wisdom is a characteristic quality of age, as vigour and enthusiasm are characteristic qualities of youth. Yet many a man grows old without becoming wise. It is of no use to sit back and expect wisdom to come with the passing years. You must do your own part in the matter by sharpening your observation and developing your insight.

There is, of course, no royal road to wisdom, no simple formula to apply to your life. But there are a few things that will be of great assistance to your upward march. Let us in conclusion set them clearly down.

1. The content of the mind is built up through experience.
2. The rational mind is one that has acquired only those sequences that occur in the real world. Its ideas are true, and its expectations are justified by events.

3. Within the range of its intelligence and the scope of its experience, every mind can be rational.
4. Reliable sequences occur in the field of human behaviour.
5. These sequences can be acquired by accurate observation, reading, and thoughtful study.
6. Wisdom is nothing more than trustworthy expectation where individual and social sequences are concerned. To use different terms, it is nothing more than insight into human nature.

Wisdom does not come quickly, nor as the result of reading a book. All a book can do is direct observation and lay down basic principles. If a man is to advance in wisdom, he must learn to observe clearly and without prejudice, to perceive principles in actual operation, and to gain insight through the simple experiences of his own life.

Finally, true wisdom involves not only the mind but the heart. It involves sympathy, forbearance and toleration. In the words of an old saying, "to understand all is to forgive all".

INDEX

- Adjustment, 7, 13-15, 16-23
- Adolescence, 101-110
 - As a social outcome, 103-106
- Advertising, 335-336
- Approval, 10-11
- Associations beyond the home, 201-203

- Birth rate, 198
- Bones, 76-77
- Bore, 205-207
- Boredom, 280-282
- Brain, 78
- Brothers and sisters (Siblings), 198-200
- Business and industry, 272-273

- Church, 270-271
- Circulation, 77
- Clique, Adolescent, 106-109
- Coercion, 334
- Commonwealth, British, 235-237
- Companionship, 11-12
- Conditioning :
 - Personal, 46-56
 - Social, 311-325
 - and Racial Groups, 317-322
- Conversation, 173-178
- Courts, 271-272
- Culture, 186-191

- Daulac, 231-232
- Defence mechanism, 162-163
- Delinquent gang, 109-110
- Democracy, 343-357

- Economy of motion, 79-80
- Education, 338-339
- Ego-enhancement, 143-154
- Emotions, 27-32
- Eugenics, 73-74

- Family, 192-203, 260-264
 - Modern, 192-194
- Fatigue, 279-280
- Fog-words, 170-173
- Freedom, 305-307
- Friendship, 373-375
- Frustration of motives, 155-166

- Glands :
 - Duct, 22
 - Endocrine, 22-23, 29

- Habit :
 - Changing of, 44-45
 - Dangers of, 40-43
 - Value of, 39-40
- Happiness, 375-377
- Heredity :
 - Chromosomes and genes, 65-68
 - and Environment, 69-72
- Humour, 179-185
- Hysteria, 165-166

- Inferiority attitude, 161-165
- Institutions, 256-274
- Intelligence :
 - Measurement, 34-36
 - Of men and women, 36-37
 - Of various races, 37
- Interest, 114-116
- International Court of Justice, 254-255

- International relationships, 252-255
- Introspection, 2-4
- Judgment, 98-100
- Justice, 307-310
- Lajimonière, 232
- Laws, 301-303
- Leaders, Selection of, 347-354
- Leadership, Preparation for, 354-357
- Learning:
 - Interest and, 114-116
 - Limits of, 123-127
 - Participation and, 112-114
 - Rote-learning, 119-120
- Manners, 296-299
- Marriage relationship, 194-196
- Mass reaction, 78-79
- Meaning, 57-63
- Mental development, 82-100
- Morals, 299-301
- Muscles, 21, 75-76
- Needs:
 - Emotional, 8-13
 - Physical, 7-8
- Nerve structure, 19-21, 78-80
- Neurasthenia, 166
- Only child, 200-201
- Parents and children, 101-103, 196-198
- Peer group, 106-110
- Personality:
 - Introversion and Extroversion, 137-139
 - Measurement, 139-142
- Persuasion, 333-334
- Physical development, 75-81
- Prestige, 9
- Problem-solving, 120-123
- Propaganda, 336-338
- Psychology:
 - Definition, 1-2
 - Methods, 2-6
- Puberty, 80-81
- Public opinion, 326-342
- Race:
 - Prejudice, 367-369
 - Stereotypes, 365-367
 - Superiority theory, 364-365
- Rationality, 83-90
- Reconditioning, 54-56
- Reflexes, 24-27
- Respiration, 77-78
- Rights, 303-305
- School, 268-270
- Security, 11
- Sense organs, 16-19
- Sequences:
 - False, 86-90, 327-328
 - True, 83-86
- Social science, vi-x
- Speech, art of, 167-178
- State, 264-268
- Study, 128-131
- Success, 9-10, 377-378
- Suggestion, 328-333
- Thinking, 90-98
- Understanding, 12-13
- Understanding Other Peoples, 358-369
- United Nations, 252-255
- Verbalism, 63, 169-170
- Westminster, Statute of, 236
- Wisdom, x-xii, 378-379
- Withdrawal, 163-165
- Work:
 - Ability to, 282-290
 - Willingness to, 290-293
- Writing, 178

